

AN
Epistolary Discourse,
Proving, from the
Scriptures and the **First Fathers,**
THAT THE
S O U L

IS
A Principle Naturally Mortal;
BUT
Immortalized Actually by the Pleasure of God,
to Punishment; or, to Reward, by its
Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit.

Wherein is Proved,
That None have the Power of Giving this Divine
Immortalizing Spirit, since the *Apostles*, but only
the BISHOPS.

By HENRY DODWELL, A.M.

That better part of us--- in and after Death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its Spiritual and Immortal Nature, as we believe; or, at least, the Will of God and his Power upholding and preserving it from Dissolution, as many of the Fathers thought. Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Art. V. p. 235, 236. 5th Edit, Lond. 1683.

L O N D O N:

Printed for R. Smith, at the *Angel* and *Bible*, without
Temple-bar. 1706.

1829
Presented to the Honorable
CHARLES HASTINGS Esq.
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the purchase of the above mentioned book. I have the pleasure to inform you that the book is now in the hands of the printer and will be ready for delivery in a few days. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. H. [illegible]
The Hon. Charles Hastings Esq.
[illegible]

229

To the Honoutable
CHARLES HATTON, Esq;

I Take this Occasion, Honoured Sir,
of leaving a Publick Monument of
my Gratitude for the many Favours you
have shewn me ever since the time I had
the Honour of being known to you. And
I cannot but congratulate that exemplary
Zeal for the Publick Good, which has
been so conspicuous in your whole Conduct,
and adds a very graceful Lustre to your
honourable Extraction. But in nothing
has this Publick Zeal more appeared,
than in, the properest Object of Zeal,
the Cause of God, and of Religion.
This you have embraced, not only as a
Cognizance of a Party (which too ma-
ny content themselves with) but as a
Guide of your Life. And that as well
in the suffering Duties of it, as those

DEDICATION.

which might have recommended you to the Esteem of Men, and have increased your worldly Honour. This is indeed to lay out the Talents, with which God has intrusted you, in a way most acceptable to him, by whom you are intrusted with them. And though it hinder your worldly Progress, yet the Rewarder of your Faith will abundantly recompence you for it. It is a Title to much better Rewards, not to have received your good things here. A Title, to have been like our Saviour in his Sufferings. A Title, to have lived the Life of Faith in the midst of a backsliding unbelieving Generation. And much more rewardable where it is more rare. Nor do the worldly Benefits lost by the Discharge of a good Conscience, bear any Proportion to the Rewards of relinquishing them. No Saint in Heaven thinks his Glories dearly purchased. None is there who would not be glad to have the Opportunity of adding to his present Fruitions, by Difficulties far greater

DEDICATION

greater than ever exercised the Patience of the most glorious Martyr. Yet our good Lord has not so been pleased to try our Faith, as to leave us wholly to the Rewards reserved for us, when our Faith shall be turned into Fruition. The same Piety which intitles us to our future Inheritance, has the Promises of this Life also. Our Sufferings even here, have such an alloy of Supports and Fruitions, to those who resign themselves entirely to the Divine Conduct, as are sufficient, not to make them tolerable only, but desirable also, though there had been nothing further reserved for us. Such are, the Satisfaction of our own Consciences, the Joys of the Heavenly Spirit, the Applause of good Men, the Reverence of even Adversaries, a fearless Concern for unavoidable Events, a confident Acquiescence in the Providence of him for whose Cause the Sufferings are undertaken, and a comfortable Expectation of that King of Terrors, who makes even the present Enjoyments of Sin-

DEDICATION.

Sinners very formidable. These Considerations make the Rewards of Sufferings for Christ, in this Life, abundantly recompensed, though there had been no further Recompense to be expected hereafter. So our Lord, manifold more in this Life, S. Luk. xviii. 30. An hundred fold now in this time, Houses, and Brethren, and Sisters, and Mothers, and Children, and Lands, with Persecutions; S. Mark x. 30. The Meaning is plainly this: That the Satisfaction of Mind, even under Losses undertaken for a good Conscience, is, even in this Life, disproportionably greater than what could have been expected from the Fruitions of the things themselves which are lost in Maintenance of a good Conscience. The worldly Wise dare not trust their Redeemer's Word for this. Nor do they qualifie themselves for knowing it experimentally. The Cross is Folly, not only to the Gentile World, but to the degenerate Professors of it in Words, whilst

DEDICATION.

whilst they do, at the same time, in their Works deny it. Yet this is the Wisdom to which you have given up your Name. This is the truest Wisdom, the Wisdom from above, which teaches you to remember your latter End, and to be wise unto Salvation. A little time will convince its present Adversaries of their own Folly in deserting it. God give them Grace to do it while they may reap the Benefit of its Instruction, before it can serve for no other end but that of aggravating their Punishment of Loss, and the intolerable Remorse of their too late awaken'd Consciences! I doubt not but that you will join in this charitable Office with

Shottesbrook,
Jan. 21. 1708.

Your most obliged

AND

Grateful Beneficiary,

Henry Dodwell.

DEDICATION.

whilst they do, at the same time, in their
 Works deny it. Yet this is the Wisdom
 to which you have given up your Name.
 This is the truest Wisdom, the Wisdom
 from above, which teaches you to re-
 member your latter End, and to re-
 vive unto Salvation. A little time will
 convince us present Admirers of their
 own Folly in deserting it. God give them
 Grace to do it while they may reap the Be-
 nefit of its Institution, before it be-
 comes for no other end but that of aggra-
 vating their Punishment of Loss, and
 the intolerable Remorse of their too late
 awakened Consciences! I doubt not but
 that you will join in this charitable Office
 with

Yours most obliged

Shorbrook
Jan. 21. 1763.

AND

Grateful Benefactor

Henry Dolewell.

P R A E M O N I T I O N .

THAT the Reader may the better understand the following Discourse, I thought it requisite, to transcribe the Passages here alluded to, out of the Letters that occasioned it. They were in all two; and both of them from an excellent Person, but as yet unknown to me.

The Fragments of the Letters which occasioned the following Discourse.

In the former he has these Words :

‘ In the first place, I own that to derive
 ‘ the Immortality and Spiritual Nature of
 ‘ the Soul, together with that Angelical
 ‘ Perfection and Happiness (for which the
 ‘ Members of the Church stand Candidates
 ‘ in this Life, to which they have an
 ‘ unquestionable Title in this Life, and of
 ‘ which they shall be possess’d in the other
 ‘ World) from an Interest in the Covenant
 ‘ with God, doth greatly enhance the value
 ‘ of the Covenant. It renders it
 ‘ which was made with Adam, renew’d
 ‘ with Seth, and retriev’d by Jesus Christ,
 ‘ most

APRÆMONITION.

‘ most Illustrious, most Worthy of God,
‘ of his Son, of the Holy Trinity, most
‘ Honourable, most Comfortable to Man.
‘ The *Jewish* Church, with all its Types,
‘ Prophecies, Figures, &c. is ennobled by
‘ being a shadow of the Christian Church,
‘ which, by the inseparable Connexion
‘ with that in Heaven, is none other than
‘ a Polity of Angelick Men, undergoing a
‘ short Discipline here on Earth, under the
‘ Regiment and Tuition of God and his
‘ Son, with, and to, whom they are uni-
‘ ted by the Holy Ghost. Besides, if the
‘ Immortality of the Soul derives only
‘ and meerly from the Covenant; I think
‘ the perplexing Difficulties about the Im-
‘ putation of Original Sin, the Traducti-
‘ on of the Soul, &c. will vanish. God
‘ will be justify’d in all his Proceedings
‘ with Men since the Fall of *Adam*, because
‘ the innumerable Millions of Men, who
‘ sprung out of his Loins, are not damn’d,
‘ (as is vulgarly believ’d) but only de-
‘ priv’d of a Privilege which was the effect
‘ of his Covenanting with Men, and which
‘ Covenant was the effect of pure Grace.
‘ From this Hypothesis also the Grace of
‘ God, through *Jesus Christ*, doth shine
‘ forth most gloriously. Inasmuch as that
‘ after the breach of the Covenant once
‘ and again, he yet should have renew’d
‘ it with *Abraham* and his Seed, and after-
‘ wards

wards have sent his Son into our Nature,
 and to this lower World to invite all
 Men into it. Moreover this Hypothe-
 sis may, in a great measure, serve to
 clear up the perplex'd Disputes about
 God's Decrees, wherewith the Church
 hath been often and much vex'd. It
 serves to these and many other good
 Purposes. [Those words relate to what
 I had said in my Discourse concerning *Mar-
 riages* out of the *Peculium*, and in my
 second *Letter of Advice for Theological
 Studies*.]

Afterwards he goes on thus: 'But
 then it hath against it all the Arguments
 which Christian Philosophers have ad-
 vanced in the Pneumaticks against the
 Atheists and Deists. It ascribes to Mat-
 ter the most stupid of things the Divine
 and Spiritual Qualities of Thought and
 Reflection, of Liberty and Consciousness,
 and will force us to ascribe all the Con-
 templations, Sagacity, Science, yea and
 Virtues of all who are not within a true
 Episcopal Communion, to the force
 of meer Mechanism. For I can conceive
 of no created thing, at least, but of Spirit,
 Matter and Motion. Yet this should be no
 hindrance to my Assent (though it be
 full as unintelligible as Transubstantia-
 tion) if God had told us of it in his
 Word, That none, but such as are with-
 in

' in the Christian Covenant, have a Prin-
 ' ciple of Immortality. The wise Man,
 ' *Ecccl. iii. 21.* ascribeth the Spirit to Man
 ' as such. It is confess'd, that *Abraham*,
 ' and the Inspired Men under the Law are
 ' Immortal, because the Spirit by whom
 ' they were inspired, made them such.
 ' And if these extraordinary Influences of
 ' the Spirit convey'd such a Virtue into a
 ' thing otherwise mortal, what shall we
 ' say of the Waters on which the Spirit
 ' mov'd? What of *Balaam's* Ass? May it
 ' not be thought, that as much stress may
 ' be laid on one of our Saviour's Parables
 ' as on any thing in all the Heathen My-
 ' thology? And it's obvious that *Dives*,
 ' whom we may presume not to have
 ' been an inspired Person, is supposed to
 ' exist, and that in no good condition,
 ' after Death. And indeed that Parable
 ' will amount to nothing, unless it prove
 ' the Happiness of a good, and the Misery
 ' of even a bad, Jew after Death. The
 ' New Testament seems to threaten the Pu-
 ' nishment of the other World to an obsti-
 ' nate Jew. 'Tis true that some learn'd
 ' Interpreters make the weeping and gnash-
 ' ing of Teeth, *Matth. viii. 12.* and the
 ' everlasting Destruction and flaming Fire,
 ' *2 Thes. i. 8, 9.* to mean no other thing
 ' but Temporal Calamity. Particularly,
 ' that which was inflicted on the Jews at
 ' the

the Destruction of their Temple and City. But this weeping and gnashing of Teeth is opposed to the sitting down with *Abraham*, &c. in the Kingdom of Heaven. And therefore should, by the Rules of good Logick, mean some other thing than Temporal Calamities. In the other place, the unquenchable Fire is denounc'd against those who obey not the Truth, who are the very same *Jews* who troubled the Christian *Thessalonians*, v. 6. And those may have as truly been the persecuting *Jews* as the Christian *Gnosticks*. And, if so, then the *extra-peculium* *Jews* are awarded to everlasting Destruction; and consequently are to be reckon'd Immortal. And if these unquenchable Flames, and everlasting Destruction, denote not the Punishments of the future State, why should these and the like Expressions signify it in other places? May not the Enemies of Religion clap such a figurative Gloss on all those places which signify the Punishments of Hell? Our Lord is stiled a Redeemer, a Saviour. And it would seem that these Legal Names had a reference to Legal Sentences past against Man. Now if our natural Death results from our natural Constitution (which it must do upon this Principle) Jesus Christ cannot be called our Redeemer, in a strict and proper sense,

' sense, by vouchsafing the Resurrection of
 ' our Body. And, in no sense, can he be
 ' called Jesus, or the Saviour of Men (those
 ' of the *Segullab* excepted) with respect to
 ' Hell. Because none, save the Members
 ' of the Church, are supposed capable of
 ' any such Punishment. With respect to
 ' Mankind in general, he may properly
 ' be called a Benefactor. But I do not see
 ' how the Name of Redeemer or Saviour
 ' can be attributed to him. And yet the
 ' Apostle styles him the Saviour of all
 ' Men, especially of such as believe. And
 ' *Rev. xxi. 8.* the Unbeliever and Idolaters
 ' are doom'd to Brimstone, &c. which is
 ' called the second Death, which one
 ' would think were no Apostates, but such
 ' as never had been within the Church.
 ' And *Mark xvi. 16.* As they who believ'd
 ' and were baptiz'd were sav'd, so they
 ' who did not believe were damned. Does
 ' Damnation here mean no other thing
 ' but a meer privation of a glorious Im-
 ' mortality? And, if it signifies any thing
 ' else, this Hypothesis falls to the Ground.
 ' If it means no other thing, then the De-
 ' spisers and virulent Opposers of the Go-
 ' spel will be in no worse Case than an
 ' *American* who never heard of it. The
 ' great Judgment is represented as Univer-
 ' sal, and not confin'd to those within the
 ' Covenant. To be sure *St. Paul* must
 ' have

have reason'd so with *Felix* and the *Athenians*. For how could the first have trembled, unless he had suppos'd himself comprehended? Or how could the Apostle's Argument have been conclusive, had he suppos'd them, whilst out of the *Peculium*, to be meer Mortals? If this Principle be true, the Apostle could not, indeed no Man can, fairly persuade any Man to become a Member of the Church, from any Motive of Fear of future Punishments. And yet it has been the most powerful in effecting a Change, more forcible than that of future Rewards. If the Laws of the Land did not punish such as keep back their Children from Baptism, the Hopes of future Rewards (when their not being entred into the *Peculium* secures them from the Fears of everlasting Misery) would not prevail with many of them.

I do not comprehend what is laid down in that Book about the Divine Seed. It is represented sometimes as a vital Principle; and other while as a Subsistence distinct from the Rational Soul; and then, as if it were the Holy Ghost himself. Care should be taken in expressing such matters, that the weak be not scandaliz'd. Now, whatever be the manner of the Holy Ghost's Inhabitation, yet it's certain that, so long as we are in
the

‘ the Body, we want repeated Assistance
 ‘ of the Holy Spirit, which is evident
 ‘ from every good Man’s Experience. And,
 ‘ unless this be granted, Prayer for In-
 ‘ crease of Grace is to no purpose.

‘ Your charitable Assistance, to help me
 ‘ through such Difficulties, is earnestly de-
 ‘ fired.

In the second Letter he writes thus :

‘ D. B.

‘ Allow me to beg your Assistance in a
 ‘ matter which not only nearly concerneth
 ‘ me, but also this poor afflicted Church
 ‘ and Clergy. It is evident that this vast
 ‘ Defection from the Communion Episco-
 ‘ pal is, in a great part, owing to our Ig-
 ‘ norance of the true Notions both of a
 ‘ Church and Clergy. To rectify this po-
 ‘ pular and dangerous Error, some late Wri-
 ‘ tings had contributed, and many were
 ‘ coming over to the Communion of the
 ‘ Church, and consequently in the road
 ‘ of becoming serious Christians. But
 ‘ these our Hopes are very much damp’d
 ‘ by the opposition that is made by the
 ‘ *Bourignonists*, who make light of Order
 ‘ Civil and Ecclesiastical. They bear it
 ‘ high, at S. Andrew’s especially. And
 ‘ the rather, because the Students were
 ‘ like to come over to Church-Principles.

‘ They

‘ They boast as if *Poirot* had worsted
 ‘ *Mr. Dodwell*. I know not of any such
 ‘ thing done by *Mr. Poirot*. Yet this ve-
 ‘ ry Boast staggers unsettled Youth. It
 ‘ were therefore worth the while to vin-
 ‘ dicate the Church against the Cavils of
 ‘ those Enthusiasts, who are likely in a
 ‘ short time to prove more dangerous than
 ‘ the Presbyterians, the last not being so
 ‘ much supported by the Populace as by
 ‘ the secular Arm.

‘ *Mr. Dodwell*, in a Book upon Marria-
 ‘ ges, makes the Immortality of the Soul
 ‘ to be the effect of the Divine Spirit,
 ‘ which he restrains to them within the
 ‘ Covenant, and by consequence all with-
 ‘ out the Christian Covenant (ordinarily)
 ‘ have no Principle of Immortality. This
 ‘ Assertion hath done much harm, it be-
 ‘ ing considered as a Notion advanced
 ‘ both against the Catholick Principles of
 ‘ the Soul’s Immortality, and Antiscriptu-
 ‘ ral. We are put hard to it in his De-
 ‘ fence. For it is told us, that the Chil-
 ‘ dren of the Kingdom, *Matth. viii. 12.*
 ‘ were the *Jews*, to whom *Mr. Dodwell*
 ‘ allows no more than a Title to the Spi-
 ‘ rit in reversion (except to such of them
 ‘ as were inspired) and yet they are said
 ‘ to be cast into outer Darkness, which
 ‘ even he confesses to signify the Punish-
 ‘ ment of the after State. We are told
 ‘ that

xviii A P R E M O N I T I O N.

' that the Day which is appointed for
 ' judging the World in Righteousness;
 ' *Act. xviii. 31.* is the Day of Judgment.
 ' And, if so, those, with whom the A-
 ' postle disputed, were to be judged.
 ' And if they were to be judged, they
 ' had a Principle of Immortality, even
 ' though without the Covenant. The
 ' Scripture tells us, that it's appointed
 ' for all Men once to dye, and after that
 ' the Judgment. And thence they infer
 ' that the Judgment must be *æquè latè pa-*
 ' *tens* as the Death. The Judgment
 ' threatened against *Chorazin* and *Beth-*
 ' *saida*, is said to be more intolerable
 ' than that of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*. And
 ' I do not think that the Calamity
 ' of *Judæa*, when that Nation and Po-
 ' lity was destroy'd, came up to that of
 ' *Sodom*. One would think that the re-
 ' sisting of the Holy Ghost, at the rate
 ' the *Jews* did, was a Sin much more
 ' heinous than a wilful unrepented Im-
 ' morality committed by a Christian;
 ' and that therefore the Righteous Judge
 ' of the World would not damn the lat-
 ' ter to endless exquisite Torments, when
 ' the other suffers no more than a tem-
 ' poral and bodily Punishment, &c.

April xxiv. 1705.
 By

A P R Æ M O N I T I O N xix

By these things the Reader will easily perceive how much this worthy Gentleman is *mistaken*, when, from the *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of *Humane Souls*, he infers the *actual Mortality* of all that are *out* of the *Peculium* by their own fault; or indeed of any one *single Person*, who is concerned in *this Case*. That neither is my *Opinion*, nor is any just *Consequence* of my *Principles*; as he will easily find, when when he has been pleased to consider my *Thoughts* delivered in the following *Discourse*. I do not think that any *adult Person* whatsoever, living where *Christianity* is *professed*, and the *Motives* of its *Credibility* are sufficiently *proposed*, can hope for the *Benefit* of *Actual Mortality*. On the contrary, I have proved all such *Unbelievers* liable to the *Condemnatory Sentence* of the *General Judgment*. I am therefore no more concerned for the Gentleman's *Arguments* of this kind, than *himself*. He is again mistaken, when he reckons all *Inspired Persons* in the *Old Testament* as endowed *actually* with the *Principle* of *Immortality*. That is precisely *against* the *Revelations* of the *New Testament*, and of the *Old Testament* also, which relate to the *Times* of the *New Testament*. I must not now repeat what I have produced to this purpose in this *Discourse* itself. The *Spirit's moving on the Face of the Waters* will

2.
The Gentleman mistakes my Hypothesis, when he takes it to suppose the actual Mortality of all who are out of Peculium.

no more make the *Waters immortal*, than his *Omnipresence* as *G O D* will make *all things so*. If it would, there would be *nothing* mortal and corruptible, because nothing can *subsist* without the all-sustaining *Spirit*. Which if it had, it must be *immortal*, if its *presence*, in *any sense*, had been *alone* sufficient for *Immortality*. But I need not here repeat what I have said in the following Discourse, for proving, that the *Immortalizing* presence of the *Spirit* is, in the current of the *New Testament*, supposed *not* to have been given to any, since the *loss* of it by the *Fall of Mankind*, till the *Resurrection* of our *Lord*, who had the *disposal* of it, as being increased with the *fulness* of the *Spirit*; of which *fulness*, all others are to *receive* their several *Proportions* respectively, *S. Joh. i. 16*. This is the *Scripture-account* of that *Immortality*, which may only seem to *deserve* the Name of *Immortality*; that is, of the *Immortality of Happiness*.

3. *Perpetual Punishment*, in the *Scripture* Phrase, is rather reckoned as a *Death*, than a *Life*. That is the *second*, and most *afflictive* *Death*. And therefore the *prolonging* of the duration is not taken for a *Life*, nor a *Favour*. Nor is it accordingly ascribed to the *Divine Spirit*, which is the *Original* of the *Diviner Life*, and of *sure of God*, than to the *Divine Spirit*.

those

those *præternatural* Favours, which are called *Grace*, and are all derived from that same *Spirit*. The *Original* therefore of that *Immortality*, if it may be so called, may be more agreeably derived from the *Divine Pleasure*, than from the *nature* of *Soul* which is thus to be *immortalized*. So *Plato* accounts for it. And so *S. Justin Martyr*, who lived nearest to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, in his words here produced. And it serves alike for the *end* and *terror* of such a *Punishment*, that the *Soul* be actually perpetuated; whether that *Perpetuity* be ascribed to the *nature* of the *Soul* itself, or whether *God* be pleased to continue the duration of it beyond the exigency or power of its own *nature*. Provided that timely warning may be given to all that are concerned in it, and the *Consequences* of it, by *Divine Revelation*; which is the only *Rational Means* for notifying the *Divine Pleasure*, in *Facts* entirely depending on the *Divine Pleasure*. And that *Revelation* will then be more credible, when it is agreeable to the *Nature* concerned in it, which is naturally inclined to believe it; as being at first ennobled with a *Divine Original*, and designed by *God* as a *Candidate* for *Immortality*, as a *Reward* of the good *Use* of his own *Free Will*. This the *Soul* has from the *νοῦς* and *Flatus*, distinct from the *πνεῦμα* or *Spirit* given

in *Baptism* to *Favourites* only, of the *true Peculium*. This intitles it to be, in some sense, a *Divine Offspring* in a *higher* sense, than the *Souls* of any other *Sublunary Animals*. Yet it will not necessarily make them *naturally Immortal*, any more than those many other *Creatures* made immediately by *God*, without any *design* of *qualifying* them for even a *præternatural Immortality*. Yet it may *recommend* them to a *Divine Concern* for them, more than for those other *Creatures* which *never* had the *Honour* done them, that might any way *intitle* them to that *Care of God* for them, which becomes a *Parent* to his own *Offspring*. And as *God* has thus admitted them to *præternatural Felicities*, as *Rewards* of their *Duty* to him; so he may oblige them to make a *prudent choice*, of what is otherwise their own *Interest*, by threatening *Punishments* of a like nature, *præternatural* and *perpetual*, if their *Interest* cannot *alone* prevail on them to *make* that *Choice*. And, having *threatned* them, his *Veracity*, as well as his *Justice*, will *oblige* him to *perform* his *Threats*, as well as his *Promises*. And all this may be the *Effect* of a *Paternal Good-will*, when it is done with a *design* of *Kindness* to every *Individual Subject* of his *Government*, as well as that of *securing* the *Body* itself, and the good *Government* of it (which is also the

Foremost of all Particulars) against the mischief that might follow from the undisciplined Use of extravagant Free Will. On these Terms he may continue their duration, to qualify them for more lasting Punishments, who would not otherwise qualify themselves for the more lasting & supernatural Rewards which he had designed for them.

God did indeed raise up Pharaoh for an example, and is said to have made the Wicked for the day of Evil. So the Old Testament represents the Case in regard of exemplary temporal Punishments, which were the only Punishments then known, either by Reasonings, or even the Divine Revelations of that Time. But God was so far from predestinating Men to Eternal Punishments, that the Revelations of even the New Testament itself represent these Punishments as not prepared for Men, but only for the Devil and his Angels. If therefore those Angels, who were naturally immortal, had not fallen, there had been no Hell at all. And Mankind is no otherwise concerned in it, by this Scripture-account of it, than as, by joining themselves to the Devil's Party, they intitle themselves to those Punishments which were prepared for the Devil and his associates. No, nor even by being subject to the Devil, on account of their being within that Jurisdiction which had been, by Providence,

4.
The Soul, that are common to all Men, do not so depend on our gross organical Bodies, as that they must necessarily perish on their dissolution from their Bodies.

allotted to him *before his fall*, and which was still *allowed him after his expulsion from Heaven*. But under such *restrictions of his Malignancy*, as the *Divine Goodness* was pleased to lay upon him, for the good of the *Sublunary Creatures*. The effect of their fall into this *subcœlestial district* had only been, that they would have been liable to the *vanity, the corruption, the mortality*, of the place to which their fall had reduced them, in the *region of darkness and shadow of death*; the power of which the *Scripture* still assigns to the *Devil*. The consequence therefore of his Fall alone, was so far from making *Men* liable to *Eternal Punishments*, that it made them *incapable of them*, by reducing them to that *strait duration* which was *natural* to them, and which could not be avoided but by an *occasion* of that nobler *præternatural Principle*, with which *God* was pleased to favour *Man* above all other *Corporeal Beings*; that of the *Divine ~~πνεύμα~~ or Flatus*, as *contradistinct* from the more properly *Divine ~~πνεύμα~~, or Spirit*. This made a difference between *Men* and the *Beasts that perish*: That the *Spirit of the Beasts went downwards*, as *falling on the Earth*, signifies *perishing in the Stile of the Holy Scriptures*; but the *Spirit of Man went upwards*, returning to the *Lord* that gave it, that is, into the *Air*, the *Abode of Humane Souls*. This plainly supposes it

not

not to depend on our gross *Organical Bodies*, nor therefore to *perish* upon its *dissolution* from *those Bodies*. And the same is supposed when our *Souls* are said to depend on the *Pleasure* of the *God* that first *breathed* them into us, as the *Fathers* here mentioned, say they do. The meaning of that Expression cannot be, that it is in his *Power* and *Pleasure* to *annihilate* them when he thinks fit. That it is not *peculiar* to our *Souls*, but *common* to them with all created *Beings* whatsoever, even *Angels*, and the most perfect *Creatures*, however pretending to an *Immortality* of their own *Nature*. The meaning therefore must be, that they do not so depend on any other created *Being*, but that they may still continue in their duration, whatsoever other created *Influences* be withdrawn from them, if *God* be pleased still to continue that *Ordinary Providence* which is essentially necessary for their continuance, who can no more continue than give their own *Being*. Withal, as it is a *Flatus*, it implies a more immediate *Dependence* on *God*, as the *Breather* of it, than other *Creatures*, which must make it cease to be, whenever he is pleased to cease to *breath* it, as being unable to continue its own *Duration* by the *Powers* given it at its first *Production*, and the continuance of those general *Influences* which are requisite for the support of *Created Beings* in general. This makes

makes its *Immortality* perfectly *Arbitrary*. And by this God put it in the Power of *Adam* to have immortalized himself by his *Obedience*. Not that the *Flatus* was it self *Immortal*, though independent on its *Organical Body*; but because that alone would have enabled him to have laid hold on the *Diviner Spirit*, a *Union* with which would have actually immortalized him. However its *independency* on the *Body* is sufficient to overthrow the modern *Paradox* of the *Φυλονομία* confuted by *Calvin* in the *Anabaptists*, though now lately revived in our own Age, so unhappy for *Innovating Paradoxes*. These pretend the *Soul* to die actually with the *Body*, and to rise again with it at the general *Resurrection*. But this very Opinion was confuted by *Origen*, and the *Synod*, which seconded him in the *Arabians* of that Age. So far it was from the sense of the *Primitive Christians*, for which I am here concerned. I mention rather the sense of the *Church* then being, than that of *Origen*, that none may think this Censure imputable to any singular Opinion of *Origen*. The *Synod* convened on that Occasion, shews plainly, that they did not look on that Doctrine as disputable, or of little Importance, but as contrary to those *Traditions* wherein the *Catholick Church* was then agreed.

Eul. H.E.
vi. 37.

But

A P R Æ M O N I T I O N. xxvii

But the *perpetuating* of a *Nature* which was not of it *self* perpetual, and the *perpetuating* it with this very *Design* that they who had *not* of themselves a *Perpetuity* of *Being*, might notwithstanding be made capable of a *Perpetuity* of *Punishment*, is so great a *hardship* on the *Creature*, as that *God* did not think it becoming him to inflict it *arbitrarily*, nor agreeable to his other *Attributes* of *Goodness* and *Mercy*. He therefore took care not to do it but for a *Crime* of a *high* *Nature*, nor till they, who were concerned, had been fairly warned of the *Crime* by a sufficient *Promulgation* of his *Pleasure* concerning it. The *Judge* of all the *Earth* could do no otherwise than *Right*, as *Abraham* pleads with him; and *Right* according to those very *Opinions* which *himself* had settled among *Men* for their good *Government*, that he might be justified in his *Saying*, and clear whenever his *Case* should be judged by any equal *Expostulation*. This required that the *Criminals* should be left destitute of any just *Apology* for themselves, as the *Apostle* reasons. But it is allowed as an equal *Plea* in all just *Judicatories*, if the *Crime* charged were not in the *Power* of the *Criminal*, or if he had no antecedent warning for avoiding it. Accordingly he took care that neither of these *Pleas* should be truly alleageable by those whose *duration* should be perpetuated for

5. This perpetuating of Human Nature for Punishment could not be justly insisted, till a Publication of God's pleasure that he judged the Devil a Publick Enemy; and that all who did not joyn the Body instituted by himself, should be taken for Associates of the Devil, and punished accordingly.

xxviii A PRÆMONITION.

for this *end*, that they might thereby be made capable of *Punishments* otherwise exceeding the *natural Powers* of their *degree of Being*. The *Devil* himself was a *Subject*, and enjoyed a *subordinate Power* under his *Creator*, and whatever *Jurisdiction* he had, he could have no *otherwise* but by the *Grant of God* himself. And therefore *Communication* with him could be no otherwise *culpable* than as it is accounted with *ill affected Subjects*, before their *Hostilities* are *notorious in themselves*, or *notified by publick Proclamations*. Then, and not till then, *joyning with them* becomes *Criminal*, and renders the *Persons joyning with them*, guilty of the same *Rebellion*, and liable to the same *Punishment* with the *principal Rebels*. Thus therefore *joyning with the Devil*, after he was a *proclaimed Rebel*, made those who did so of his *Party*, and, by becoming so, liable to the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Associates*, from that time forward, though it was not so before. Till such a publick *Notification* it is no more *Treasonable* to maintain a *civil Conversation* with *Traitors* than with other *Subjects*. And the *subordinate Power* allowed the *Devil* by *God*, supposed him also a *Subject*, and a *Member* of that great *Society* of which *God* is the *Head*, as well as the good *Angels*. This *Proclamation* therefore of the *Devil* as a publick *Enemy*, is peculiarly the
Office

Office of the *Gospel*: Especially as relating to the Affairs of Souls. Nor can any such thing be pretended, that I know of, from any Passages of the *Old Testament*, but only such as relate to the State of the *Gospel*. But it is the main *Effect* of the *Gospel* it self, to proclaim the *Devil* a *Publick Enemy* to the *Kingdom of Heaven* preached by it, to denounce *War* against him, and to oblige all true *Subjects* of that *Kingdom* to joyn in the *War* against him, and to forbear, from thence forward, all *Communication* with him, under pain of sharing in his *Punishment*. That is, in that lower *Hell*, which was not originally designed for *Men*, but for him, and such as should willingly partake in his *Rebellion*. Under this Dispensation it is that our Blessed Lord has set up his *Standard*, his *σύνθημα*, as the Prophet *Isaiah* calls it, like the *Arrier Bands*, still in use in several Countries, in Case of extreme danger, summoning every *Individual Subject* to repair to it, and threatening to treat them as *Enemies* themselves if afterwards they countenance the *Hostile Body* against which the *War* is proclaimed. This leaves no place for *Neutrality*, reckoning those as *Enemies* who do not list themselves in the *Prince's Service*, though they should not openly list themselves with his *Adversaries*, and making them liable to the *Punishment* intended for professed

Ene.

Enemies. Which is the very Case described in the Scriptures, of allotting them to the *Tartarean Fire* prepared for the *Devil and his Angels*. Nor does our *Saviour* allow of any *Neutrality*. So he warns us very plainly that *he also will judge in our present Case.* *He that is not with me, is against me: and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.* S. Matth. xii. 30. S. Luk. xi. 23. And all the Solemnities of *initiating* us into this *Spiritual Warfare* is proper to the *Gospel*. The *Cross* of *Christ* is indeed the *Military Standard* prophesied in the *Old Testament* concerning our *new Dispensation* in the *latter days* wherein we live. And so it was understood by our *Christian Ancestors*. The *New Testament* calls our Profession *ἀσκησία*, and makes our *Warfare* against *Spiritual Wickednesses in Heavenly Places*, and ascribes their *Ejection* out of *Heaven* to the good Success of this *War* against them. And the *Shield* of *Faith* is to quench the *fiery darts* of the *Devil*. And the *Triumph* over the *Devil* and his *Party* is in the *Cross*. So in our *Ecclesiastical Rites* of *Initiation*, our *Military Spmbol* or *Word* (to use the Phrase of our modern *Tacticks*) is the *Creed*; our *Military Oath* is, in our *Christian Sacraments*; the *Forms* of *τῷ Χριστῷ* and *ἀπο τῶν ἐναντιῶν τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, are also plainly *Military*, and our *Renunciations* are expressly against the *Devil*; and of the
World

A P R A E M O N I T I O N. xxx

World, and the Flesh no otherwise than as they help the Devil to Objects and Dispositions, and seasonable Opportunities for ensnaring us. He therefore alone is the Lord and Tyrant of those unhappy Souls which lose their Liberty of being conquered, and, by the Right of War, became his Slaves. All these things are properly New Testament Revelations, and therefore cannot affect those, who never heard of those Revelations, so as to involve them in Punishments disproportionate to their Nature, and which were not originally designed for Men at all, but Devils: nor for Men even now any otherwise then as by not joyning Christ, he himself has declared that he will so interpret it as if they had joyned themselves to the Devil. Thus they are supposed to entitle themselves to the Punishment of the Devils, by making their Cause the same with that of the Devils. Yet even these things also, which, in this way of Reasoning, make wicked Men liable to these Eternal Punishments are not Revelations of the Old Testament, but of the New. It is our Blessed Lord that has assured us, that the Prince of this World is judged, S. Joh. xvi. 11. It is S. Jude that teaches us, That the Angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, are reserved in everlasting Chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day, v. 6. It is S. Peter, from whom

whom we learn, that God has delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto Judgment, 2 Ep. ii. 4. The Book of Enoch indeed shews some received Opinions concerning these things, even in the Apostolical Age. But in vain shall we expect any distinct account from the Old Testament, of the Punishment of fallen Angels where there is so little mention of the Fall. Their Fall is indeed supposed, and, perhaps, alluded to in some Prophecies of the Old Testament. But no particular of this Sentence against them, nothing of their being chained, and that in Chains of Darkness. Nothing of their being reserved for Judgment, or of the day appointed for their Judgment. These were indeed Conjectures taken up by the Hellenists, perhaps from some footsteps of Primitive Tradition. But they never had the Authority of Divine Revelation (which was that alone that could assure us of Facts of this Nature) till the times of the New Testament. These are they alone which assure us, that they are then designed for that lower^d Adⁿs, which was known among the Heathens by the name of Tartarus. How then could Men be warned that they should be reckoned as of the Devil's Party, whilst the Devil was not yet declared as the Head of a Party? How could they be threatned with the Punishment, which did no otherwise belong to them than as they were

A P R Æ M O N I T I O N. xxxiii

were of that Party, whilst there were yet no clear and distinct Revelations concerning the nature of those Punishments which were impossible to be known otherwise than by Divine Revelation: If this Title of Men, to Preternatural and Eternal Punishments must commence from the time where-in the Devil was proclaimed a publick Enemy: This Supposition puts it in the Arbitrary Power of God when they should commence, because it was perfectly Arbitrary to him, when he would be pleased to notify his Pleasure in this matter, and to proclaim the Devil a publick Enemy. And their being Arbitrary will make them most agreeable to the nature of the Rewards, by which our new Legislation receives its Sanction, which being Preternatural and Supernatural, can be no other than Arbitrary. If therefore this notification began with the Gospel, the Punishment must begin so too. Yet the Hypothesis of Preaching and Baptizing in Adms, as an Ordinary Means for saving them who lived before the Publication of the Gospel, will easily make them liable to the same Punishment at the last day, who never heard of the Gospel, whilst they were in their Bodies, if God be pleased to make them concerned in it.

b

But

6. But I did not derive this *Publication* of
The Publication of the Devil as an open Enemy, began from the beginning of the Gospel. *God's Pleasure* in this matter *high* enough, when I traced no *earlier* Footsteps of it, than from the time of *St. Paul's Sermon* to the *Athenians*. I now take the true *Original Promulgation* of this *new Law*, to have been from those *Words* of our *Saviour*, enjoining the *Promulgation* of his *Gospel*: *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* So *S. Mark* xvi. 15, 16. who is so far from being an *Epitomator* of *S. Matthew* (as some conceive him) that he is *fuller* than *S. Matthew* himself, or any of the other *Evangelists*, at least in this *Particular*. The Word is *κατακριθῆναι*. That Word properly signifies the *condemnatory Sentence* given in a *κρίσις*, which indifferently denotes a Sentence of *Absolution*, as well as of *Condemnation*, *Rom. ii. 1.* This is the *κατακρίσις* of the *κόσμος*, *1 Cor. xi. 32.* As the *World* signifies the *opposite Body* to that of *Christ*, that is, that *Body* of which the *Devil* is the *Head*, and the *God*, and the *Prince*, in the *Stile* of the *New Testament*. It is the same with the *κρίμα* elsewhere, which also generally signifies the *worst* Sense. It is stiled *κρίμα αἰώνιον*, *Ebr. vi. 2.* And *κρίμα τῷ Διαβόλῃ*, *1 Tim. iii. 6.* To shew that it is a Sentence to an *Eternal Punishment*, like

like that which was passed on the *Devil*, to which *wicked Men* make themselves obnoxious, by their *not* siding with our common *Lord*, when *required* to do so. So *Tatian* explains it, that it is their *Society* with the *Devils* that makes them liable to the *Punishment* of *Devils*. *Kpious* also, tho' otherwise (as I said) of a *middle* Signification, yet, in the *New Testament*, it is almost appropriated to the *harsher* Sense. So coming ἐκ χρίσιν is opposed to *having Everlasting Life*, which is taken for the same as *passing from Death to Life*, S. *John* v. 24. *Kpious* thus understood, must be the same with the καὶ ἀχρίσιν denounced by our *Saviour* against the *Unbelievers* of the *Gospel*. This therefore can be no other but the κόλασις τῷ Διαβόλῳ mentioned by the *Apostolical Ignatius*, in his famous *Epistle* to the *Romans*. That *Punishment* which is to be inflicted on the *Devil* by the Λόγος, the χρίσις in the ἡμέρα κρίσεως designed for the *Devil*, according to the *Opinion* of the *Hellenists*, confirmed by the *Revelations* of the *New Testament*. That very χρίσις which is opposed by the *Apostle* to a simple ἀπώλεια, *Rom.* ii. 12. and which is there ascribed to a νόμος, like that by which we are all sentenced to *Death* in *Adam*. And thus it appears, that they are *reckoned* as of the *Devils Party*, who are to be punished by that very *Punishment* which was originally

nally designed for none but Devils. Yet this *xpius* belongs to all that do not receive the Gospel, when it is sufficiently proposed to them. So the Evangelist; *Ἄνθρωποι δὲ ἐμίσησαν τὸ φῶς, ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν κακὰ ἦσαν*, that Light is come into the World, and Men loved Darkness rather than Light, because their Deeds were Evil, S. John iii. 19. By disbelieving the Gospel, they disown the Society of Christ, who is by him said to be the Light that enlightens every one that cometh into the World. And by continuing in their Original Darkness when they might have Light, they are interpreted to love that Darkness rather than the Light refused by them, and consequently to chuse his Party, who is the Prince of Darkness. And this is said to be the Cause that makes them liable to this *xpius*, which belongs to them as the Associates of the Devil, that they do not receive the Gospel when sufficiently proposed to them. This is the Meaning of the Opposition between Light and Darkness in the first Catholick Epistle of S. John, and of the ways of Light and Darkness in the Catholick Epistle of S. Barnabas. They thereby shew, that the Gospel, since its Publication, admits of no Neutrality; but that whoever does not embrace the Gospel, shall, for that Reason, be judged to chuse the Party of the Prince of Darkness; and shall therefore be adjudged to that outer Tartarean Darkness where he is chained, and partake of

A P R A E M O N I T I O N. xxxvii

of that *Judgment* of the *great Day*, for which he is reserved in those *Chains*. This therefore is the *Meaning* of the *Damnation* denounced by our *Saviour* against *Disbelievers* of his *Gospel*. And this *Authority* *S. Paul* had for letting the *Athenians* know the *Terms* on which they were obliged to receive the *Gospel*. And this was the *Rule* for all the other *Apostles* also in their *Preachings*, to oblige their *Auditors* to receive their *Doctrine*, and to enter into their *Communion*. They never allow any *middle State* in their *Auditors* between *Light* and *Darkness*, between *Christ* and *Belial*, between the *Table* of the *Lord*, and the *Table* of *Devils*; between *Everlasting Salvation*, and the *Everlasting Damnation* to the *Fire* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. And they always reckon them in the *State* of *preternatural Misery*, till they might be prevailed on to qualify themselves for *Supernatural Happiness*, by joining in *External Communion* with themselves, as being alone authorized to receive them to the *Mystical* and *Invisible Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*.

Here therefore began this *Obligation*, as 7.
it concerned all *Men*, and every where, as it is supposed in
the *Apostle* expresses it, in his *Sermon* to the *Preaching* of our
the *Athenians*; that is, as it concerned *Bl. Savi-*
all *Nations*, as well as that of the *Jews*, our, and of
and all *Countries* as well as *Palestine*. This *S. John the*

xxxviii A P R Æ M O N I T I O N.

Extent of it began from this Command of our Saviour to his Apostles, immediately before his Departure from them. At least from the time that they were convinced of the Right of other Nations to be received into the new Peculium ; and of their own Duty to Preach to them, and to invite and receive them into their privileged Body. Yet, even before all Nations were thought concerned in it, they who heard of the Gospel, either from our Saviour himself in Person, or from S. John the Baptist, are represented as lying under the same Obligation to receive it under the like Penalty of that Eternal Fire which was prepared for the Devil and his Angels, in case they failed of doing so. The Fire threaten'd by our Lord himself to his own Auditors, is the γέννα πυρός, S. Matth. v. 22. xviii. 9. S. Mark ix. 43. 45. alluding to that of the Valley of Hinnom, which is generally understood of the Tartarean Fire. And that it is not misunderstood when it is thought so, appears from the Epithets ascribed to it, of its being unextinguishable and eternal, S. Mark ix. 43, 44, 45, 46, 48. and the same is implied in the Worm that is joined with it, that is said never to die. This would add no new Degree of Terror to the Criminals, that the Fire, or the Worm, were Eternal, if themselves might hope not to be so. Plainly therefore the Punishment here threat-

A PRÆMONITION. XXXIX

threaten'd, is such as belongs to *Immortal Spirits*, such as the *Devils* themselves are, and such as *they* also must be supposed to be, who are to be *qualified* for suffering the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. Nor did this *begin* with the *Preaching* of our *Blessed Lord* himself. The *earliest* *Epocha* of the *Gospel*, is from the *Preaching* of *S. John the Baptist*. Yet even he also supposes the same *Obligation* on his *Auditors*, to *join* with *him* in his *Doctrine* and *Baptism*, which were both of them *preparatory* to the *Doctrine* and *Baptism* of our *Saviour*. He warns them of the *ὄργη μέλλουσα*, *S. Matth. iii. 7. S. Luke iii. 7.* The same Phrase is elsewhere paraphrased by the *κρίσις τῆς γενέσεως*, *S. Matth. xxiii. 33.* which plainly makes them liable to the *condemnatory Sentence* of the *Judgment* which is to be passed against the *Devil* and his *Associates*. This is the *Wrath* of *God* which *abides* on the *Disobedient*, *Eph. v. 6. Col. iii. 6.* that is, for them who *obey not* the *Gospel*, in the *Epistle* to the *Thessalonians*. The *Wrath* prepared for the *Vessels of Wrath*, *fitted for Destruction*, *Rom. ix. 22.* The *Wrath* of the *Lamb*, the *great day* of his *Wrath*, *Rev. vi. 16, 17.* The *Wine-press* of his *Wrath*, *Rev. xiv. 19. xix. 15.* in allusion to the like Phrase in *Isaiah*. That very *Wrath* to come, from which it is our *Saviour's Office* to *deliver* us, *1 Thsse. i. 10.*

This can be no other but the *Wrath* designed for the *Devils*, who are the proper *Sons* and *Vessels* of *Wrath*, which *Men* are no otherwise intitled to, than as they are of his *Party*. He warns them also of the usual Fate of *unprofitable Trees*, whose end is to be cut down and cast into the *Fire*, S. *Matth.* iii. 10. This is a Similitude elsewhere used by our *Saviour* himself, S. *Matth.* vii. 19. 1 *John* xv. 6. It is taken from the *Notions* of the *Rustick Writers*, that when a *Tree* is twice dead, that is, for two years together has born nothing, it is then to be judged as past hopes of Recovery to its vegetative Life, and is therefore to be cut down, as cumbring the *Ground*, as being thenceforward no otherwise useful than for the *Hearth* on which it is to be burned. That is really the Case of the *Vine* especially, which is most frequently compared with the State of our *Christian Life*, whose *Wood* is otherwise unuseful, and has nothing else to recommend it to the Care of *Men* besides its *Fruitfulness*. This is alluded to by our *Saviour* in his Parable. And by S. *Jude* in his ἀναγραφὰ δὲ ἀποστα-
ρόντων, ἐπιζωδόντων, v. 12. οἱ δὲ ὅσοι τῷ ἀνό-
τητος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τέλειται v. 13. This is plainly the σκότος ἐξώτερον, as described al-
most in the same Words, in 2 *Pet.* ii. 17. It is also joined with *Fire*. So 2 *S. Pet.* iii. 7.
τηνύμενοι πυρὶ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας
τῶν

τῶν ἀρεβῶν ἀνδράων. What can this be but that very *Darkness*, and that very *Fire*, which were prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*? These *ungodly Men* therefore must be such as have made themselves *Partakers* of his *Punishment*, by joining themselves to him in his *Rebellion*. Thus it appears, that from the very beginning of the *Publication* of the *Gospel*, the *Devil* has been proclaimed as a *publick Enemy* of the *Souls of Men*; and as a *Head* of all *Rebellion*, who should make all *Human Souls* also liable to those *Punishments* (which were indeed fitted to the *Nature* of *Devils*, though *preternatural* to *Men*) who should not join with *Christ*, in *Opposition* to him, upon the *Summons* of the *Gospel*. But there is nothing of this in the *Old Testament*. The *Devil* is there represented as *envious* of the *Prosperity* of *Mankind*, and an *Accuser*, and a *Suggester* of pernicious *Counsels*. But without any mention of any *Design* farther than *Eternals*. There he robbed *Adam*, and, by *Consequence*, his *Posterity*, of the *Temporal Felicities* of the *Visible Paradise*. There he tempts *Job* to *Impatience* and *Murmuring* against the *Divine Providence*, by the *Temporal Calamities* which *God* permitted him to inflict upon him. There he brought a *Plague* on the whole *Body* of *Israel*, by tempting *David*

David to an ostentatious numbering of them. There he drew *Abab* into a War with the *Syrians*, which proved fatal to him, by being a *Lying Spirit*, prophesying Success in the Mouth of those *Prophets*, who had otherwise been used to *Truer Inspirations*. There he opposes the *High-Priesthood* of *Joshua* the Son of *Josedek*, by performing his Office of a *Slanderer* and *False Accuser*. But we can find nothing there concerning any Power allowed him for drawing *Human Souls* into a *Participation* of his *Punishment* in their *Separate State*.

8.

The Rab-
bins per-
fectly igno-
rant of any
Divine
Tradition
concerning
the Natu-
ral Im-
mortality
of Hu-
mane
Souls in
general.

If I had thought *Rabbinical Testimo-*
nies satisfactory for proving *Opinions* re-
ceived among the *Jews* of the *Apostolical*
Age; more might have been said from
them for *disproving* the *Tradition* of the
Doctrine of the *Natural Immortality* of
Humane Souls. It is a *Maxim* with them,
that all *Israelites*, and none but *Israelites*,
are to have a *Portion* in the *Future Age*
under the *Messias*. This may indeed be
understood of the *Immortal Happiness* of
that *Age*, which they appropriate to their
own *Nation* and the *Profelytes* incorporated
into it, who can alone plead an *Interest* in
their *Messias*, as being of the same *Extraction*
with him. But this would again have per-
plexed them, in giving an *Account* of the
State of *Heathen Souls*, if the *Doctrine* of
the

the *Natural Immortality* of all *Humane*, even *Heathen*, *Souls* had been received by them as an *Original Divine Tradition* from their *Ancestors*. For this *Doctrine* would exclude them from *Eternal Happiness*. And *Eternal Misery* is too great an *Evil* to be inflicted on them by *Divine Goodness* arbitrarily. And their being of another *Nation*, could not alone be *Merit* sufficient for it. It was neither their *Crime*, nor was it their own *Choice*, but *Divine Providence*, that made them so. Nor can there be any *Third* *Eternal State* suitable to the *Nature* of a *Rational Soul*; neither *happy*, nor *miserable*, as there must be, if those *Souls* be *naturally Immortal*. I might mention those who interpret the Passage of *Psal. i.* that the *Sinners shall not stand in the Judgment*, of their *perishing for ever*. So the Famous *R. David Kimchi*. I might also mention those, who understand the *slinging the Souls* of the *Wicked* as out of a *Sling* of *Annihilation*, because it is opposed to *binding* in the *Bundle of Life. 1 Sam. xxv.* I might mention other *Rabbinical Authorities*, which make the *Deluge* and the *Fire of Sodom* *Specimens* of *Hell*; (*δαιμονία* is the Word in *S. Jude* concerning *Sodom*) and therefore excuses them from those future *Eternal Pains* of the *Day of Judgment*, by an *Annihilation*; as being *discharged* from the *real Punishment*, as having born it in *Effigie*.

Ac-

Accordingly they thought that those *Antediluvians* and the *Sodomites* were neither to rise again, nor to be presented before the Divine Tribunal at the *General Judgment*. As if they believed the *Souls* of those Delinquents extinguished immediately on the Dissolution of their *Bodies*. So the Excellent Dr. *Windet*, §. 9. This Observation of those *Rabbins* is directly contrary to that of Dr. *Hammond*, who thinks them actually punished with *Eternal Torments*, for that very same Reason; but otherwise interpreted, because they were δαῖψα αἰώνις τωπος. But that is none of my Concern at present. The Use I make of these Observations now, is only to shew, that our present *Rabbins* know of no *Tradition* derived from their *Ancestors* concerning the *Natural Immortality* of *Human Souls*. For by the same Reason for which they believe some *Human Souls* actually *Mortal*, they must believe all naturally so, if they believe our *Human Generation* *Univocal*, and that *Human Souls* are all of the same Nature. The Divine Attribute of *Goodness* will more easily allow of an *Arbitrary Advancement*, than of an *Arbitrary Debasing*, of what God himself has been pleased to make an *Ingredient* in our *Natural Constitution*. The innocentest way therefore of making them actually *Dye*, is rather to leave such *Souls* to the *Consequences* of their own Nature, unassisted by
extra-

extraordinary and therefore *undue*, Divine Influences; than *directly* to *destroy*, or to deny them *arbitrarily* any thing necessary to their *Subsistence*, by the *Exigency* of their *Nature*; which *Exigency* also is occasioned by a *Law* made by himself. But, I confess, I have not that Opinion of *Rabbinical Traditions*, as to take them for competent Proofs of the *Opinions* of their *Ancestors* of the *Apostles* Age; without better corroborating Proof, that such *Opinions* were *then* received. I have therefore chosen to insist on such *Testimonies* as were, in my Opinion, more *conclusive*; that is, of those who *lived* in that *Age* themselves.

I have withal here shewn, that this *Divine Spirit* cannot now be received from any but *Bishops*, as *Successors* to the *Apostles* in all the *highest Acts* of their *Ordinary Authority*; which was not to fail upon the extinction of the *Persons* of the *Apostles*, as grounded on those *Extraordinary Gifts* and *Rights* which were only *Personal*, and were *extinguished* with their *Persons*. But much more so, as they are *Successors* of our Lord himself in that very *Prerogative* wherein he was *above* all the other *Apostles*, either *singly* understood; or *collectively*, as He was the *Visible Head* of the *Mystical Union* of the *Spirit*; so that none of them could have the *Divine Spirit*, unless

9.

The Right here insisted on of the Bishops alone for conferring the Spirit, destroys all Right to the Mystical Heavenly Communion in them who are divided from their respective Bishops.

they received it from *him*. Nor could they continue it any longer than they continued their *Communication* with *him*, any more than a *broken Branch* of a *Vine* can continue its *Vegetative Life* any longer than it continues its *Incorporation* in the *Vine*, for deriving those *present* and *perpetual Influences* which are as necessary for continuing this *Vegetative Life*, as deriving it at first. Nor any more than a *Member* of our *Animal Bodies* can continue its *Animal Life*, without *Communion* with the *Head*; from which all the *Body*, by *Joints* and *Bands* having *Nourishment* ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Col. ii. 19. These are *Scripture-Examples*, explaining the necessary dependence of the *Members* of the *Mystical Body* on their *Head*, in order to their *Participation* of this *Divine* and *Immortal Life*, to which we are entitled by the *Spirit*. And this Reasoning is used in these *Sacred Writings*, with a particular regard to the *Visible Body* of the *Church* in this *World*, to convince its *Members* of their unavoidable *Duty*, to continue in its *External Visible Communion*, and in *Subjection* to its *Visible Head*, if they will continue their *Right* to the *Invisible Communion* of the *Spirit*, and their *Mystical* influences from the *Father* and the *Son*, as *Heads* of that *Mystical Communion*, as transacting all their *Covenanting Commerce* with us in
this

A PRÆMONITION. xlvii

this Life, no otherwise than by the Visible Heads deriving Authority from them, to represent and conclude them. So S. John Reasons in his first Catholick Epistle, for proving a $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu\omega\iota\alpha$ with himself and his Fellow Apostles necessary, in order to the maintaining the Mystical Invisible $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu\omega\iota\alpha$ with the Father and the Son. S. Cyprian makes it as impossible to continue the Vital Spiritual Influences in Members separate from the Visible Body, and rebelling against its Visible Head, as it is to continue a stream upon an interruption of it from its Fountain, or a Sun-beam upon the interposition of an Opacous Body between it and the Sun. The Reasoning holds still as long as the World, and the Church in this World, lasts. For the Covenant is still the same to oblige the Church in Heaven by Acts of the Church on Earth; and to oblige all the Members of the Church on Earth to their Duty to their Earthly Superiours in affairs of this Nature, under Pain, if they violate that Duty, of overthrowing all the pretensions to Benefits to be ratified in Heaven. The Body of the Church now, is as much the same with what it was in the Apostles Age, as it is possible to be in a Body consisting of Mortal Individuals. And therefore the Government is the same suitably to the Nature of the Body, the same Apostolical Power conveyed downwards through a succession of Mortal Men,

such

such as the *Apostles* themselves were. And therefore if a *Rebellion* against them *then* was a *Rebellion* against the *Father* and the *Son*, it must be so *still*, and leave the *Rebels* destitute of all the invaluable *Benefits* of *Mystical Communion*. And the *Reasoning*, I have here insisted on, proves it to be so *à Priori*. The *Mystical Communion* is the *Communion* of the *Spirit*, by which we *communicate* with the *Father*, as the *Spirit* is his *Seed*, and as our *participation* of that *Spirit* does entitle us to be his *Sons*, in a *higher* and a more *peculiar* way than the *word* or *Flatus* does, which is *common* to all *Mankind*, though *that* also does in a *lower* way entitle all who have it to be his *Offspring*. However, as this *κοινωνία* makes as of one *Civitas* or *Patria* with the *Father*, so it is the *peculiar Prerogative* of this *higher* and *Diviner Spirit*. For this alone qualifies us for *ascending* to *Heaven* properly so called, which the *Scripture* represents us the *peculiar Residence* of the *Father*, and to which it is the *Sons Office* to *bring* us when he finishes his *Mediatorial Office*, and *delivers* up his *Government* to the *Father*. That is the *time* for *bringing* the many *Sons* unto *glory*. By it we also *communicate* with the *Son* as having the *Fulness* of the *Spirit*, from *whom* we must derive our *share* of it, our *Grace for Grace*, according to the *measure* he is pleased to allot us, respectively.

If

If therefore *this* be derivable only from the *Bishop*, how can we expect any of the *Benefits* of the *Celestial Communion*, but by *Visible Communion* with the *Bishop*? And that this was the Opinion of those who lived in that *part* of the *Apostles Age* where- in the *Ordinary Government* of the *Church* was settled (who could not possibly be ignorant what *Rights* were designed for that *Sacred Order*) appears from hence, that the *Bishop*, and he alone, was then taken for the *Authorized Representative* of *God* and *Christ*, as I have shewn in my *Parænesis*, from the best *Witnesses* now extant of those times, the *Apostolical Ignatius*. I am sure, a far more competent *Witness* than the *Guesses* and *Reasonings* of *Blondel*, and his *Party*, from *Negative Testimonies*, before any *Ordinary Government* was settled. From hence it appears that the *Bishop alone* could oblige *God* and *Christ* to give the *Spirit*, because he only was their *Authorized Representative* who had it in their *Power* to give it. The rather so, because he represented them, not by any thing that was common to him with *Ordinary Presbyters*, but by what was peculiar to him on account of his *Right* to the first *Chair*. He, and he alone, who was the *Head* of the *Presbytery* could represent them as *Subordinate Heads* of the *Mystical Unity*. He, and he alone, could represent them as a *Principle* of *Unity*, who

c

could

could *oblige* the whole Church to *be*, and *continue*, one *Body*, by *obliging* them all to *acquiesce* in the determinations of a *single Person*, who could *not* otherwise *divide* the *Body*, than by being *divided* from himself. Nor could he more effectually *maintain* this *Unity* of the *Spirit* than by having this *Ministerial* distribution of the *Spirit* appropriated to his *Office*, as our Blessed *Saviour* had the distribution of the particular *Gifts* and *Graces* of the *Spirit*, by being himself the *Fulness* of this *Divine Seed* of the *Spirit*, from whom all *others* were to *receive* it, if they would pretend to any good *Title* to it. Thus then the *Reasoning* would proceed, that all *Pretenders* to the *Spirit* who had not *received* it from the *Bishop* could not have that *Divine Spirit*, which was the *Bond* of *Mystical Ecclesiastical Unity*; and therefore could have no other but the *ill Spirit*, since our *Lord* had taken away all pretences for *Neutrality*, by declaring them all *publick Enemies*, who were *not* joined with *himself*; and by declaring them *Despisers* of *himself*, who *despised* his *Authorized Vicegerents*. Nor has *Blondel* produced one single *Instance*, at *Baptism*, of the *Spirit's* being administered by any ordinary *Presbyter* before the *IVth. Century*; nor even then any allowed *Instance* that it was ever so administered but by the *leave* of the *Bishop*. It is strange that he should
make

make the *prohibitory Canons* an Argument that this liberty of giving the *Baptismal Spirit* was the *Right of common Presbyters* Originally, when he could not find any *Example* that *Ordinary Presbyters* did pretend to give it before the now-mentioned *Century*, either with, or without the *Bishops leave*. All he could infer from thence, could only be, that some *private Presbyter* had *pretended* to this Power before the *Canons* which *prohibited* them. But that they did it, as claiming an *Original Right* to do it, he *has* not, he *could* not prove. The *contrary* appears, that none but *Bishops* were thought to have a *Right* to give the *Spirit*, by *Testimonies* much *elder* than those *Canons*. It is supposed on both sides in the elder *Disputes* concerning the *Validity* of *Baptisms* by *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*. However they *differed* concerning the *Water-Baptisms* of *opposite Communions*, yet they neither of them believed the *Spirit* given out of the *Church*, nor without the *Imposition of Hands* of a *Catholick Bishop*. And it is notorious in the *allowed Practice* of the *Church*, that none but *Bishops* were *owned* to have the *Right of Admitting* to *Communion*, or *excluding* from it, which was a real *Consequence* from this *Right* of their giving the *Spirit*, or *withdrawing* it, by which this *monopoly* was to be maintained, as being indeed no other than the

καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος. Accordingly the *Bishops* own none other for their *Colleagues* but their *Fellow Bishops*. None had the *Right* of giving or receiving *Communicatory Letters* as addressed to them but *Bishops*. Not even the *Presbyters* in a *full See*, any otherwise than by the *Bishops Orders* or *Permission*. If they did otherwise, they are counted *Rebels*, as well as other *Affronters* of the *common Authority* of the *Society*. None others had a *Right* of *subscribing Definientes* to their *Synodical Canons*, as being those alone who could *undertake* for their respective *Bodies*. They, as *immediately representing God and Christ* were, on that account, believed *Supreme* and *Unappealable*, within their own respective *Districts*, in particulars belonging properly to their *Spiritual Jurisdiction*. And it is counted as *absurd* to judge of such a Cause determined by the *Bishop*, as to judge of *God and Christ*, from whom they were believed to have received such an *unaccountable Authority*. So *S. Cyprian*, and the other *Bishops* of his *Age*, among whom a *Catholick Correspondence* was maintained on this *Principle*. So the *Apocalyptick Angels*, who are commended for all the *Good*, and charged with all the *Blame*, of their, respective *Jurisdctions*. Which could not have been if they had been *controulable* by a *Majority* of *Suffrages* of their several *Presbyteries*.
 They

A P R A E M O N I T I O N .

lii

They governed indeed by the *Counsel* of their *Presbyters*, but were no more determined by the *Majority* of their *Suffrages*, than our *Princes* are by the *Suffrages* of their *Councils*, though their *Edicts* run in that *Form*, as if they had been issued by their *Advice* and *Authority*. That very *Learned Man*, in his most elaborate *Collection*, has not produced any single *Instance* of any thing referred to the *Suffrages* of the *Presbyteries*. So far he is from any thing that was carried in them against the persevering Sense of the *Bishop*. So far is this *Moderatorship* of a *Chair-man* from the true Power of *Primitive, Catholick, Apostolick Episcopacy*.

This Argument I have insisted on, with a particular Regard to the Case of those *Enthusiasts* mentioned in the Letter now transcribed. But it fits the Case of *Separatists* from *Episcopal* Communion, of what Denomination soever, as well as that of the *Enthusiasts*. None of them can expect the *Benefits* of any *privileged Society*, if they will not submit to the *Laws* and *Governours* of it. No, not unless they will submit to the *Governours* of it in *this World*, if *God* be pleased to incorporate it into a *Society*, even in *this World* also. None of them can expect to be treated otherwise than as *Enemies*, and as *Fellow-Rebels* with

10.

This dependence on Episcopacy, for receiving the Spirit, concerns the case of all Separatists from Episcopacy, as well as Enthusiasts,

the Devil, when God has notified his Resolution to treat them as *Enemies*, and as *Subjects* and *Soldiers* of the Devil, who are wanting to themselves in not joining themselves to the *Body* of his own *Subjects* and *Favourites*, and to those *Governours* of it who derive that same *Authority*, as it is capable of being derived by *Mortals* at a distance, by a *Succession* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, when they also were visible here on *Earth*. What can they pretend in this *Reasoning* incongruous to the *Nature* of *privileged Societies* in general, or to the *particular Nature* of our *Christian Societies*, as settled by *Christ* and his *Apostles*? If they can shew nothing so, methinks they should not venture to censure *Ignatius* as mad or blasphemous, for declaring them *Servants* to the Devil, who then separated from *Episcopal Communion*. They may easily understand how much better he might know *Facts*, and *Doctrines* too, of the *Apostles* in their *latter times*, than themselves can now, who have not one even *Canonical History* of those *latter times*. They know withal how impossible it was for him to have been transported by any *Prejudice* against their own *Innovations*, which it was impossible for him to know without a *Divine Revelation*; which, if he had, it must have also been as impossible for him to have been mistaken in his *Judgment* concerning them.

But

A PRÆMONITION.

lv

But I have shewn it perfectly agreeable to the Sense of *those times*, as far as we can trace it from our few remaining Monuments. I have shewn, that God himself has contrived the matter so, that none can have the *Mystical Communion* without the *Spirit*; nor the *Spirit* without a *Visible Communion* that is *Episcopal*. This I think I have already proved, in what I have said concerning the *Spirit*. I have endeavoured to prove it likewise concerning *Remission of Sins*, and the *Incorporation* into the *Mystical Body of Christ* in both the *Sacraments*, which make us *one Body*, as well as *one Spirit* with him, and all the other *Benefits* consequent to that *Incorporation*, in a short Discourse drawn up many years ago, upon the Subject of *Sacerdotal Absolution*; which, upon this occasion, I thought fit to communicate to the Reader. The rather so, because it proceeds on the same Topick of the *Divine Contrivance* of the *Spiritual Society*. Which is certainly more cogent than our Adversary's Reasonings from *Scriptures* elder than the *Constitution* of *Government* in any other Church, besides that of *Jerusalem*.

How little are our *Dividers* aware of these *Consequences* wherein they are so deeply concerned? And withal, how impatient of having them fairly represented to them? They possess themselves with *Prejudices* a-

II.

An applicatory Address to the Separatists, in treating

them to consider the Reasons here offered impartially.

gainst us, and pretend us *immoderate* for the *Severity* of our *Conclusions*, and take this for an *Excuse* for not *examining* into the *Merit* of our *Cause*. This is the way to make their *Case desperate*, if our *Reasons* should prove indeed so *convincing*, and their *Danger* consequently so *great* as we believe it. And can they think us *immoderate* that we are not *indifferent* what becomes of their *Souls*, the *Purchase* of the *Blood* of our dearest *Lord*? Can they tell us how we can better express our *good will* to them, than by that *vehement Concern* for their *Good*, which they are pleased to expose under the *odious* Epithet of *Immoderation*? Can they find in their *Hearts* to be *displeased* at us, for venturing the *Effects* of their present *Prejudices* against us, rather than suffering them to persevere *unwarned* in those *Courses* which we believe of so irreparably *pernicious* *Consequence* to those most *important* *Interests* which ought to be *dearest*, as to *themselves*, so to all who unfeignedly *love* them? But how can they, in earnest, *know* that we are *immoderate*, without entring upon the *Consideration* of the *Merit* of the *Cause*? They must not so interpret their *Notion* of *Moderation*, as to make its *Offices* inconsistent with the *Offices* of true *Zeal*, which are as unquestionably *obliging*, and as much *recommended* in the *Scripture*, as the *Moderation* they so much pretend

pretend to. And the best *Expedient*, I know of, for *judging* when *severe* Censures are to be judged *immoderate*, is to be taken from the *Merit* of the *Cause*; when that is first impartially settled. If the *Cause* be very *momentous*, and the *Evidence* great and certain, and the *Concern* no more than what is *suitable* to that *Momentousness* and *Evidence*; who can think the Censure *immoderate*, or exceeding the *Bounds* of due and just *Severity*, which is by all owned as a *Virtue*, and to contain nothing that a *good Man* needs to be *ashamed* of? This plainly requires their having *examined* it before they can be admitted as competent *Judges* of *Immoderation*. Till they have done so, it is impossible for them to *judge* how far the *Temper* of the *Person* is ingredient in the *asperity* of the *Censure*; because, till *then*, it is impossible for them to know how far the *Censure* is *just* and *reasonable*. Till *then*, they cannot judge for *themselves*. How then can they have that *higher Degree* of *Certainty*, which is requisite to qualify them to judge of the *Case* of *others*, whether they be acted more by *Reason* or *Malignity* of *Temper*. For this they must have that *Evidence* as *themselves*, at least, may judge sufficient, *not* only to satisfy *themselves*, but all *others* also who are not *wilfully* wanting to themselves. But I see no reason why they should concern *Persons*

sons at all in Disputes of this Nature. So far it is from being justifiable to *prejudge* against *Reasons*, upon a *Presumption* of *Ill will*, in the Person who produces them. It is no Concern of *private* Persons to judge at all of the good or ill *meaning* of Persons not committed to our *Charge*, where the Judgment is of no other use but pure *Speculation*. And *Hearts* of *Men* are far more difficult to be judged of, than their *Arguments*. Why should they change an *easier* for a more *difficult* Dispute? The *Cause* is that for which they must be responsible to *God* and their own *Consciences*. And the *Arguments* are they by which *God* will judge, whether they had sufficient *Evidence* to oblige them to *espouse* that *Cause*. And these, as they are not the *stronger*, so neither are they the *weaker*, for the *Indifferency* or *Zeal* of the *Proponents*. Let them therefore *secure themselves* by a solid and satisfactory *Answer* to our *Arguments*. And they will, at the same time, perform a *charitable* Office to *us*, in *easing* us of our hard *Opinions* of their *State*, if they can prove our hard *Opinions* *groundless*. Till they do so, they cannot expect it: Nor can they believe that we *love* them, or have that real *Concern* for *Souls*, which becomes *zealous Honourers* of our common *Lord* the *Lover* of *Souls*, if we can believe them in great *danger*, yet neither
warn

A PRÆMONITION.

lix

warn them of it, nor be vehemently concerned for them, while it is in their *Power*, upon warning, to avoid it. One would think the *Greatness* of the *Danger* should be a *Recommendation* of the *Love* that is shewn in warning of it. So we use to judge in Cases of incomparably less Importance. The good God, on whose Attribute our *Latitudinarians* so much depend, did not think it inconsistent with his *Goodness*, to threaten these *Evils*, which they judge so hardly of. No, nor to terrifie them, by such *Threats*, to make an *Election* of what is otherwise so advantageous to them. Why then should they misinterpret it as an Argument of *Ill will* to them, that we urge, with all possible *Importunity*, the same well-designed *Terrors* of the greatest and most sincere Promoter of their greatest *Interests*? The urging them can no more contribute to the bringing them upon them, than a wise *Physician's* warning of an Ailing (most certainly *Mortal* if neglected, but as certainly curable in them who secure themselves the Benefit of his good *Counsel*) can to the mortality that will unavoidably follow on the neglect. But the considering our Reasons, may either ease us of the Trouble our Good will to them occasions to us, if their Answers can be satisfactory: Or put them upon safer *Expedients* for their own Good,

Good, if they should fall short of their *own Expectation*. Nor do we in the least *prejudge* them, if they can satisfy us that their *Case* is not so dangerous as we believe it. All we pretend to, in the meantime, is to *awaken* their *Diligence* in *considering* them, for which the *Importance* of the *Matter* is certainly a very proper *Inducement*. *Ignorance* of *Law* is not allowed as *pleadable* in any *Legal Courts*, when the *Law* itself, and the *Punishment* attending the *Violation* of it, are sufficiently *notified*. Nor is there any *Relief* of *Equity* admitted, if the *Criminal* himself cannot deny his having *heard* of the *Law*, and the severe *Punishment* threatned upon the *Violation* of it. That is presumed sufficient to oblige him, in regard of his own *Interest*, to use all *Moral Diligence* to inform *himself*, where his *Misinformation* may prove of so *Fatal Consequence* to him. And the greater the *Evil* is, to which his *Error* may expose him, the greater his *Obligation* is, to *prevent* [an *Error* that may be so *pernicious*. This, and this alone, is my *Design* in being so *plain* and *particular* in my *Charges* against their *Case*, wherein their *Persons* are no otherwise concerned, than as they are *pleased* to make that very *Case* their own. It is to let them see their *Obligation* to *examine* the *Reasons* that *prove* their *Case* so *dangerous*, and that they are not

not at the same Liberty, *not* to trouble themselves with a serious and accurate *Examination* of them, as they might have been, if the *Case* concerning them had been *secure*, or not so very *dangerous* as indeed it is. And who can deny their *Case* to be *dangerous*, if it be such as our *Reasons* prove it, if they be indeed *conclusive*? If they can *neither* pretend to *Remission* of their *Sins*, tho' otherwise *qualified*, if they had been of the *Body* to which the *Promise* of *Remission* belonged: If they can pretend no Interest in *Christ*, neither of being *one Body*, nor *one Spirit*, with him: If they be *destitute* of the *Spirit* of *Christ*, and, for that Reason, still *subject* to the *Devil*, the capital *Enemy* of *Christ*, and thereby consequently liable to the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*: Who can deny, but that these are *Considerations* sufficient to excite their utmost *Diligence*, at least, as to an impartial *Examination*? That is all that I design at present, not any way *prejudging* concerning the *Event*. If, upon that *Examination*, they can prove their present Condition *secure*. I shall heartily *congratulate* their *Success*. If they cannot, I know no *Expedient* that they can then be able to pretend for *securing* themselves, but that which I have been so importunately *urging* them, that of a timely Return to a *safer Communion*, which can then be no other but *Episcopal*. That

That Sacerdotal Absolution, is necessary for the Remission of SINS, even of those who are truly Penitent.

1. **B**Y *Sacerdotal Absolution*, I understand the Priest's Approbation of the Penitent, as a Person interested in those Promises of Remission which are revealed in the Gospel, however it be signified; whether by express Words, as it had been the Practice of the *Later Church*; or by Behaviour, proper only to a Person so qualified.

2. By *Necessary*, I mean, not absolutely, in regard of God; but ordinarily, in regard of the Penitent. So that the Penitent (who cannot expect the *Extraordinary* Uncovenanted Mercies of God for his Salvation) cannot expect Remission without this *Sacerdotal Absolution*, as a Condition ordinarily necessary.

3. By *Sins* I mean, not only such as are notorious, and scandalous, and of Publick Cognizance; but all such also, whatever they may be, whereby the Priest may be able to judge concerning the State of the Penitent, however he came to know them; whe-

A PRÆMONITION. Ixiiii

whether by *Personal Converse*, or *Private Information* by others, or the *Voluntary Particular Confession* of the *Penitent* himself.

P R O O F.

That no *truly Penitent* Person can *expect* Prop. I.
Remission of his *Sins* (at least in order to the obtaining those *Good Things* that are *promised* in the *New Covenant*) by virtue of the *Penitence* itself, without the *Divine Bounty* and *Indulgence* accepting it; not for its own *Worth*, but *God's Pleasure*.

Seeing therefore this *Acceptance* depends Prop. II.
on the *Divine Pleasure*, no *Penitent* can assure himself of *Acceptance* by any other Means, than by *such* whereby he may be assured that *God* is *pleased* to accept them.

The *Pleasure* of *God* to accept of *Peni-* Prop. III.
tents cannot otherwise be known, but by our *Interest* in the *New Covenant*, wherein he has been pleased to *declare*, that he *will* accept of them.

This *Remission* of *Sins* promised in the Prop. IV.
New Covenant cannot (in an ordinary way) be *expected* by any, but those who make use of the *Ordinary Means* prescribed by the *New Covenant*.

The *Ordinary Means* prescribed by the prop. V.
New Covenant revealed in the *Gospel* for the *Remission* of *Sins*, are *both* the *Sacraments*. But especially (for *daily Inadvertencies*,
and

and *Relapses after Baptism*) that of the *Holy Eucharist*.

Prop. VI They who are by God empowered to admit *to*, or exclude *from*, the *Eucharist*, (the *Sacrament* concerning *adult* Christians, of whom we are now chiefly discoursing) are also empowered to apply this *New-Covenant-Remission*, or exclude from it; so that without their *Consent*, no *Application* can be made.

Prop. VII. *Priests*, are they who are thus empowered to admit *to*, or exclude *from*, the *Eucharist* under the *Gospel*.

This Power of the *Priests*, for excluding *from*, or admitting *to*, the *Sacraments*, appears from these following Considerations:

1. *They*, and they *only*, can admit *to*, or exclude *from*, the *Sacraments*; who have a *Dominion* over the *Exterior Symbols*.

2. *They*, and they *only*, have the *Dominion* of these *Exterior Symbols*, who *alone* have the Power of *Consecrating* them.

3. *They*, and they *alone*, have the Power of *Consecrating* these *Symbols*, who are *Legally* called thereunto.

4. *They*, and they *only*, are *Legally* called hereunto, who are *separated* for this Employment by those who are already invested with the *Original Supreme and Independent Power* of the *Church*.

5. None

5. None are thus *separated* for this Employment of *Consecrating* the *Eucharist*, but only *Priests*, in the utmost Primitive *Latitude* of the Word, as it contains not only those who are strictly and rigorously so called, but *Bishops* also.

6. This *Power*, which necessarily follows from this *Appropriation* of the *Dominion* of the *Sacramental Symbols* to the *Clerical Function*, cannot be conceived to be given by Christ to them *unawares*, but *designedly*.

7. Christ therefore *designing* to put the *Ordinary Means* of *Remission* of *Sins* into the *Power* of the *Priesthood*, must consequently *oblige* all to a *Dependance on*, and a *Subjection to*, the *Priesthood*, under *Pain* of *Deprivation* of the *Ordinary Means* of the *Remission* of their *Sins*.

8. This *Obligation* will extend to all Cases wherein Men cannot *expect*; nay, and be *sure* of, God's *supplying* his *Want* of *Ordinary Means*, by *Extraordinary Favours*. For no *Prudent* Person would venture himself on *Extraordinaries*, where he might have any *Hopes* left of being supplied by *Ordinary Means*.

9. There can be no *Hopes* of *Extraordinary Favours* but on a perfect *Impossibility*, either *Physical*, or *Legal*, of obtaining *Ordinary Means*.

d

10. This

10. This *Impossibility* cannot be pretended, where the *Ordinary Means* may be had, either by any *Moral Diligence*, or by any *not unlawful Compliance*.

11. The Design of all this seems to be, to oblige all *Laicks* to a *Voluntary Obedience* to their *Clergy*, (even in *Times of Persecution*, when no other Means can be used) by a sense of their own greatest *Interest*, which is so highly concerned in paying that *Obedience*.

12. Supposing the Preservation of the *Priest's Authority* to be the End of this Design of *Christ*, that *Right* of the *Priests* will be the *principal* thing necessary to be secured by this *Obedience*. So that the Reception of the *Elements* will be no otherwise necessary to the *Remission* of our *Sins*, than as our Duty to receive those *Elements*, in order to that *Remission*, obliges us to depend on the *Consent* of the *Priests*, who alone can give us those *Elements*, and who alone can oblige God to ratify in *Heaven* what is transacted by them in *Earth*, by the *Authority* they have received from God himself.

13. However, this way of giving the *External Symbols*, is the *Ordinary Means* whereby *Christ* himself has obliged *Priests* to signify their *Consent* and *Approbation* of *Persons* to be admitted as *Members* of their *Body*, so as may most advance the *Edification*

fication of the People in a way of sensible Devotion.

14. Yet where these *Arbitrary Means* cannot conveniently be provided, (whether through want of the *Elements*, or of a convenient *Number of Communicants* requisite for the Solemnity) then the *Priest* admitting of the Person as fitted for the Reception of the *Symbols*, if they might be had, by a Form of *Words*, signifying his *Approbation* of the *Qualifications* of the Person for receiving the *Symbols* themselves: This Act, I say, of the *Priest* may (by this Reasoning) as certainly apply the *Benefit* of the *Covenant* to the Person so disposed, as if the *Exterior Symbols* themselves were administered to him.

15. But whether of these two Means be to be used (I mean of the *Symbols* themselves or of a *Verbal Absolution*) the *Communicant* is to be concluded by the *Priest*, as the competent *Judg*. The *Priest's Right* not the *Communicants*, being here principally concerned; It thence follows that the *Judgment* of the *Priest*, not of the *Communicants*, concerning the convenient time for giving the *External Symbols* themselves is herein to be principally regarded.

16. The *Priest* therefore being the *Competent Judg* of this Case; it follows that, though he were mistaken in omitting the use

of the *Elements* without sufficient necessity, yet, the *Remission* of *Sins* (being grounded on the *Priests Right* of admitting to the *Privilege* of *Remission* by way of *Covenant*) is as *Validly* made over to the *Penitent*, as if he had not been so *mistaken*.

This *Hypothesis*, I conceive, to proceed on the most *unexceptionable* Principles of any that I have seen, most of its Foundations being *admitted* by our separating *Adversaries* themselves. I take it also to be most conformable to the *Evidence* of *Scripture*, and *Catholick* (especially *Primitive*) *Tradition* in these matters. It neither *affirms* any thing that is not *expresly* taught by the *Scriptures* and that *Tradition*; nor *determines* any thing that was then permitted to the *liberty* of *private* Disputants. I further take it to be most agreeable to the *Jewish* and *Heathen* Practices (from whence those *Rituals* were principally derived) of expiating *Piacular Criminal Persons*. withal it seems to me to give the most *Rational* Account, why, under such a *Spiritual* Oeconomy, as that is of our common *Christianity* (professedly designed for the *Elevation* of Mens Minds above all unnecessary Condescension to Sense) *Christ* should yet be pleased to *approve* and *institute* the *Eternal* Observation of some few *Rituals*, which might *Cement* the *External*

nal Unity of the *Visible Body* of the Church in this World. It is the further recommendation of this same *Hypothesis*, that it keeps the *Mean* betwixt making the *Absolution* of the *Priest* so *Operative*, as to excuse the *Penitent* from some part of his *Duty*; or, on the contrary, the *Penitence* of the Person (even when supposed *True*) so *Self-sufficient* as to supersede the necessity of the *External Intervention* of the *Priest*, for completing the *Absolution*, so necessary for the *Penitent*. These are the two *Extremes* under which all other *Hypotheses*, I think, have laboured, Nor is it less serviceable for removing those mutual *misunderstandings*, which the inconvenient *Explications* of these very important Affairs have occasioned, even among *Candid* and *Intelligent Persons*.

A P R E M O N I T I O N

The Contents of the Præmonition.

TH E Fragments of the Letters which occasioned the following Discourse, §. 1. The Gentleman mistakes my Hypothesis, when he takes it to suppose the actual Mortality of all who are out of the Peculium, §. 2. The actually Immortalizing Souls to Punishment, may, possibly be better ascribed to the Pleasure of God, than to the Divine Spirit, §. 3. The Souls that are common to all Mankind, do not so depend on our gross organized Bodies, as that they must necessarily perish on their Dissolution from their Bodies, §. 4. This perpetuating of Human Nature for Punishment, could not be justly inflicted till a Publication of God's Pleasure, that he judged the Devil a publick Enemy; and that all who did not join the Body instituted by himself, should be taken for Associates of the Devil, and punished accordingly, §. 5. The Publication of the Devil as an open Enemy, began from the beginning of the Gospel, §. 6. It is supposed in the Preaching of our Blessed Saviour, and of St. John the Baptist, §. 7. The Rabbins perfectly ignorant of any Divine Tradition concerning the natural Immortality of Human Souls in general, §. 8. The Right here insisted on of the Bishops alone for conferring the Spirit, destroys all Right to the Mystical Heavenly Communion, in them who are divided from their respective Bishops, §. 9. This dependance on Episcopacy, for receiving the Spirit, concerns the Case of all Separatists from Episcopacy, as well as Enthusiasts, §. 10. An applicatory Address to the Separatists, intreating them to consider the Reasons, here offered, impartially, §. 11.

THE

THE
CONTENTS
OF THE
Epistolary Discourse.

THE Address, §. 1. The Scripture owns all our Title to Immortality to proceed from the Spirit. Yet so, as to own the Immortality of them to Punishment, who hear the Gospel, tho they do not receive it, §. 2. The Form of proceeding in the general Judgment, mentioned by our Saviour, supposes all who are to be concerned in that Judgment, to have heard of the Gospel, §. 3. The Scripture plainly supposes a great difference between the Punishment of them who never had heard of the Gospel,

C O N T E N T S.

spel, and of those who had heard of and rejected it, §. 4. Unbelievers are the Persons designed in the Scripture for Eternal Punishments. Who must therefore be supposed to have heard of the Gospel, §. 5. The place of S. John v. 28, 29. answered, §. 6. The Doctrine of deriving Immortality from the Divine Spirit, is perfectly agreeable to the Notions received by the Jews in the Apostolical Age, §. 7. It is also agreeable to those Heathen Originals, from whence the Phrases of the New Testament concerning this Matter are derived, §. 8. The Doctrine is owned by S. Justin Martyr, §. 9. And by Tatian, §. 10. And S. Irenæus, §. 11. And Athenagoras, §. 12. And Theophilus Antiochenus, §. 13. Tertullian thought the Soul ex traduce, and therefore naturally Mortal, §. 14. That Opinion of Tertullian, though generally deserted in the end of the 4th Century (when the Opinion that favoured the natural Immortality of the Soul began) yet

was

CONTENTS.

was not, even then condemned, §. 15. Tertullian is also otherwise very full in asserting the natural Mortality of the Soul, and in deriving its actual Immortality from the Spirit, §. 16. Origen knew no Tradition of the Church in his Age against that Opinion of Tertullian, though himself differed greatly from it. No, nor Pamphilus, nor Eusebius, §. 17. S. Cyprian owns the same Distinction between our first Birth, by which we receive our Souls; and the second Birth, by which we receive the Spirit, §. 18. Arnobius owns our Souls mortal in their own Nature, and immortal only by the Spirit, §. 19. So also Lactantius, §. 20. S. Athanasius owns the natural Mortality of the Soul, and ascribes its actual Immortality to the Spirit received from the *Λόγος*, §. 21. The same S. Athanasius, and the Catholick Church with him, prove the Necessity of our Saviour's assuming even the Supreme part of our Human Souls against the Apollinarists, that even that might be rescued from

CONTENTS.

from actual Mortality, §. 22. *This Distinction between Soul and Spirit supposed in the Disputes with the Hereticks from the days of the Apostles themselves,* §. 23. *The Doctrine of the natural Mortality of the Soul, thus explained, can have no ill Influence on our present Practice,* §. 24. *The Immortalizing Principle was generally believed not ingredient in the nature of the Human Soul, among the Heathens themselves,* §. 25. *The Primitive Christians disliked the Doctrine of the natural Immortality of the Soul, in Origen and others; and reasoned on Principles inconsistent with the Belief of it,* §. 26. *The Immortality of the Soul, is a Revelation of the Gospel; and therefore not capable of being proved by Reasons from the Nature of the Soul itself,* §. 27. *Even the Jews of the Apostles Age (though many of them believed the Immortality of Human Souls, yet) knew of no Divine Revelation that might assure them of it,* §. 28. *The Title to the Spirit*

CONTENTS.

on account of the former Peculium was perfectly arbitrary : So they who were not profelyred into that Peculium, seem to have been so long left to their natural Mortality, §. 29. The Universality of those, who are mentioned as concerned in the Revelations of the Gospel, does not necessarily include any more of the Gentiles, than those who lived after the Preaching of the Gospel, and who had heard it preached to them, §. 30. There is no necessity, that all who died in Adam should be immortalized by Christ, §. 31. The Apostle intimates, that, in the space between Adam and Moses, they, who had not the Spirit, were left to their actual Mortality, §. 32. The Light that enlightens every Man that cometh into the World is the *φῶς*, not the *πνεῦμα*, §. 33. The Dead in Christ who are to rise first, are not opposed to the Dead out of Christ, but to those who do not continue in him till their Death, §. 34. They who knew of no Divine Law by which they were

CONTENTS.

were to be judged, are supposed by the Apostle to perish, rather than to be concerned in the Judgment relating to the Breakers of the Law, §. 35. Yet they might probably persevere in their Being till the day of the general Judgment. The Punishment of the Sodomites not in Hell-Fire, §. 36. Nor could it be Hell-Fire which S. Jude (in the Case of the Sodomites) calls Eternal Fire, §. 37. The ~~won~~ which is in all Men, (though it be of a Divine Original, yet) does not make us actually Immortal, but only dispose us for a Union with the Spirit, §. 38. No Ordinary Means settled for conveying the Spirit before the Gospel, §. 39. Faith is (by the terms of the Gospel) requisite for receiving the Immortalizing Spirit, §. 40. Therefore the Antients (even of the Apostolical Age) believed, that our Saviour preached to the separate Souls of those who deceased before the Incarnation, §. 41. Water-Baptism also necessary (by the Gospel) for receiving the Spirit, Which

CONTENTS.

Which the Antients believed to have been given to the separate Souls of them who had no means of attaining it when living, §. 42. Renunciation of the Devil, necessary for the Spirit. Which was also believed performable in the separate state, by those who could not know their Duty before, §. 43. The Gentiles also are owned by Hermas to have received the Spirit, by our Saviour's Baptism, in their separate State, §. 44. Our Saviour's Preaching was only to the Souls of the Jews, that of Apostles was also to those of the Gentiles, according to the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus, §. 45. No Patriarchal Covenants can oblige Posterity to consent to the hazard of Eternal Misery, §. 46. God's appropriating the Old Peculium did not exclude the Gentiles, then living, from the Benefit of the New Peculium, relating to their Souls, §. 47. The highest part of the Rational Soul (as distinguished from the Divine Spirit) is called a Spirit. Yet naturally Mortal, §. 48. Yet it is, in

CONTENTS.

*a lower Sense, Divine, as being of a Divine Original, and as qualifying us for a Union with that truly Divine Spirit, by which we are actually Immortalized, §. 49. The Primitive Christians suppose this distinction of the Two Souls in Man, as Fundamental, in their Disputes with their Co-eval Hereticks, §. 50. They also suppose the Reasonable Soul it self to be a Derivation from Christ, as the *Λόγος*, §. 51. Our Saviour, as Christ, was anointed in his Human Nature, by the fulness of the Divine Spirit. And, on that account, as well as that of the *Λόγος*, he gained a Right of being styled the Son of God; §. 52. That same Spirit being the Seed of the Father, but derived to us by our Saviour, will make us the Sons of God, and Brethren of our Saviour, §. 53. The Spirit abiding in us, is a Prerogative of the Gospel. What is meant by that Form of Speech, §. 54. The same distinction appears in this, that the Air is the proper *Αἶς* for separate Souls; but*

CONTENTS.

but Heaven is the proper Abode of the Spirit, §. 55. This Spirit is the Principle of Mystical Unity, as obliging all, that receive it, to depend on him from whom they all Originally received it. What is meant by *'AutoGen'*, or having Life in himself, §. 56. Thus therefore all Members of Churches were obliged to depend on their respective Governours, in order to the receiving of the Spirit, §. 57. The Spirit was not, in the earliest Ages, thought derivable to any Members of the Churches, but from the Heads of those Churches, §. 58. None but Bishops were left, by the Apostolical Age, in possession of this Power of giving the Spirit. And they gave it by *Uction*, which none could consecrate besides themselves, §. 59. A naturally mortal Soul is more agreeable to be joined with a naturally mortal Body, as a Constituent of Human Nature, than a Soul naturally Immortal, §. 60. By this Distinction, the best and clearest Account may be given of the truly Catho-
lick

CONTENTS.

- lick Doctrine of Original Sin, §. 61.
The same Distinction gives an easie account of the Doctrine of Reprobation, so far as that Doctrine is Scriptural, §. 62. It gives withal, the easiest account of the Justice of **External** Torments; particularly, with relation to the Cases of Infants dying Unbaptized, and of Heathens who never heard of the Gospel, §. 63. The Conclusion, §. 64.
-

THE
DISTINCTION
BETWEEN
Soul and Spirit,

Affected from
Scripture and the Purest Antiquity.

AND

The Great Use of that *Distinction*
shewn, in several of the *Difficult-*
est Questions in Divinity.

Honoured Sir,

I Received both your Papers by Mr. Gad-
derer. But, not knowing who, or ^{The Ad-}
where you were, I was in hopes of a ^{dress.}
Personal Conference with you, on the
Subjects mentioned by you, when my Af-
fairs should call me to *London*. I was a-
ware of the populous *Prejudices* against the
Opinions you speak of, and was unwilling
B to

The Distinction between

to concern them any farther in the Disputes that occasion'd them, than needs must, if I might have any respect of carrying my principal Cause against the *Schism*, without concerning them in it. Besides, I was afraid that a Subject of that *Consequence*, and wherein so many things were to be asserted against the most *received* Opinions, might take me off, and detain me too long from my other Studies ; especially if they should prove *less* important to the *Publick*, than those from which they must divert me. These Considerations make me loath to think of *writing*, if I might have the Advantage of debating your Subjects by word of *Mouth* ; yet finding these popular Prejudices to *increase*, I have at length been prevailed on, to enquire what Reason can be pretended for them ; and to communicate the Result of my Enquiry to the *Publick*, that *others* may judge of them, as well as I my self, especially my truly *Catholick Superiors*.

2.

The Scripture owns all our Title to Immortality to proceed from the Spirit. Yet so, as to own the Immortality of them to Punishment, who hear the Gospel, who they do not receive it.

I do not, I dare not, prescribe to better Judges. But this I can assure you, that the Sentiments you think so *hardly* of, would not be more acceptable to *me*, than they are to *you* ; if I thought them either *Antiscriptural*, or against any truly *Catholick* Principles. So firmly we are agreed in

those

those Standards of Revealed Truth. This, I hope, may qualify me for your Favour, in what I have to say. In truth, I am sensible how much I am beholden to your Favour, for that I am conscious of how little I have deserved it, and therefore dare not be so ingrateful as to distrust your Favour. But what is it, I beseech you, that can be thought, I do not say *Anti-Scriptural*, but even *Unscriptural*, in the Hypothesis on which I reason? Is it that I distinguish the two Men, the *Earthly* and the *Heavenly*? Is it that I distinguish the two *εἴδη* of those two Men, and make the *ψυχὴ* to be the *εἶδος* of the *Earthly Man*; and the *πνεῦμα* to be the *εἶδος* of the *Heavenly*? And does not the Apostle either expressly say, or as plainly suppose, those things in his Reasoning in 1 Cor. 15. as I do? Is it that I make the *ψυχὴ* a *Mortal Principle*, and the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, called so from that Principle, *Mortal* also? or that I make the *ψυχὴ*, and not the *πνεῦμα*, to be all that we derive from the *Earthly Adam*, and whereby we bear the *εἶδος* of the *Protoplast*? And does not the Reasoning of the Apostle suppose all these things as plainly as I do? Why else does he expressly affirm, that we all die in Adam, supposing us to be in Adam, while we only bear his *εἶδος*, as we are in Christ, by bearing his *εἶδος*, which is the *Heavenly Spirit*? Why does he suppose this

The Distinction between

ψυχὴν ὥς to be *corruptible* and *mortal*,
 in *opposition* to the ἀθάνατον ὥς, with
 which when it is *invested* (that is the Apo-
 stle's own Phrase, ἐνδύσασθαι 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.
 ἐπενδύσασθαι, 2 Cor. v. 3, 4.) it is thencefor-
 ward said to have *put on Incorruption* and
Immortality: *ib.* Why does he derive all
 the *Title* to the *Resurrection* from *Christ*, if
 it be due to all those, who neither were,
 nor were *qualified* to be *his*, as he is *Christ*,
 in any Sense; not even that *lowest* Sense, at
 least, of being *visible Members* of his *Mysti-
 cal Body*, the *Church*? Such are by no
 means *qualified* for the higher *Mystical Uni-
 on* of the *Spirit*; and whoever has *not* the
Spirit of Christ, is *none* of his, *Rom.* viii. 9.
 To be sure he cannot pretend it on Account
 of *this Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, that de-
 rives all *Title* to the *Resurrection* from that
 very same *Spirit*. The *Apostle's other* *Rea-
 sonings*, do also *immediately* derive this *Ti-
 tle* from *Christ* himself. *If there be no Re-
 surrection of the Dead*, then is *Christ* not *ri-
 sen*, v. 13. *If the Dead rise not*, then is not
Christ raised, v. 16. These *Reasonings* can
 only reach them who *sleep in Jesus*. 1 *Thess.*
 iv. 14. *the Dead in Christ*, v. 16. not as
 opposed to them who are dead *out of Christ*,
 but to those *Christians* who shall be *alive* at
 the *Resurrection*, v. 17. For as *Adam* and
Eve are called *Adam*, *Gen.* v. 2. so *Christ*
 and his *Church* are called *Christ*, 1 *Cor.* xii.

12. And *Christians* are said to be in *Christ*, as well as *Christ* in *them*, *John* xvii. 23. *Rom.* viii. 1. xvi. 7. But then they are said to be in *Christ* who *profess* him, though they do not live answerably to their *Profession*. As *Judas*, the *Son of Perdition*, is said to be given to *Christ* by his *Father*, *John* xvii 12. And they are said to be *bought* by *Christ*, who *deny the Lord that bought them*, and who, by *denying* him, do *bring upon themselves swift Destruction*, 2 *S. Pet.* ii. 1. As they are said to go out of the *Church*, who *never were really* of the *Church*, 1 *S. John* ii. 19. So *Christ's Net* includes the *Bad* as well as the *Good Fish*, *S. Matth.* xiii. 47, 48. As the *Field of Christ* contains the *Tares* as well as the *Good Seed*, v. 24, 25. And this very agreeable to the *Design* himself so frequently owns in the *Scriptures*, of *punishing* them the most *severely*, who had been admitted to the greatest *Favours*, as thereby making their *Wickedness* the more *piacular*. This will perfectly reach all that have been actually *proselyted* to the *Christian Religion*, and admitted actually into *Christian Communion*. Nor can it be thought *hard dealing*, if God be pleased to *oblige* all (that *hear of the Gospel*, and have it in their *Power* to be so admitted, if they please) to entitle themselves to *Eternal Rewards*, under pain (in case of their being wanting to themselves therein) of incur-

ring *Eternal Punishments*. This also seems rather agreeable to the *Design* of God to do so, when the Apostles insist on this Topic of the *future Judgments* for obliging *Profelytes* to come over to the Christian Religion. So St. Paul does with the *Athenians*, *Acts* xviii. 31. and with *Felix*, *Acts* xxiv. 25. plainly intimating, that they must be concerned in that *Judgment*, if they did not secure themselves by embracing the *Gospel* and the *true Communion*: so they also explain themselves, when consulted by their Auditors, what they should do to be saved. *Acts* ii. 38. 40. xvi. 31. No doubt the *Salvation* intended in these Cases, was from that which is elsewhere called *the Wrath* to come. Thus this Hypothesis will concern all who have the *Gospel preached* to them. And it does not appear by the accounts of that general *Judgment* given in the *Gospel*, that any were concerned in that *Judgment*, besides those who had warning of that *Judgment*, by having the *Gospel* preached to them.

3. Our Saviour himself, in his own Description of it, ascribes all the *Rewardableness* of the good Works of the *Righteous*, to their having been done for his sake. He could not otherwise say; *In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me*, *S. Matt.* xxv. *The form of proceeding in the general Judgment mentioned by our Saviour, supposes all, who are to be concerned in that Judgment, to have been of the Gospel.*

xxv. 40. So, on the contrary, he imputes the *Punishableness* of the *Uncharitableness* of the *Wicked*, to their affronting and neglecting *himself*, in neglecting the Performance of good Offices to the meanest of his Members ; *In as much as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me*, v. 45. Both these Sentences suppose the Persons concerned in them, not ignorant that Christ had undertaken to reward Benefits conferred, and to *punish* Neglects of doing such Benefits, to the Members of his *Mystical Body* : yet his *making* such a *Body*, and the *Obligation* resulting thence to concern *himself* for them, being things wholly depending on his Arbitrary *Pleasure*, were impossible to be *known*, without the *Revelations* he was pleased to make of his *Pleasure* in the *Gospel*. It was impossible for any to do *Charity* on *Christ's* Account, or to *affront* *him* in neglecting it, who never had heard that there was a *Christ*, or that he had been pleased to concern *himself* in the *Benefits* or *Injuries* of his Worshipers. These *Forms* therefore could never affect Persons who had never *heard* of the *Revelations* of the *Gospel* : If therefore such Persons are to be *judged* there, it must be by *another* Form which *cannot* be *known*, and therefore ought not to be *believed*, till it can be *proved* from the *Scriptures*. Yet I exclude not the *good Deeds* and *Sins* of the *Jews*,

The Distinction between

before Christ's coming, from those Rewards and Punishments : for Christ, as the Λόγος was their Governour then, as their Government was Theocratical, which was a Favour granted then to no other Nation but theirs. For the Father was not supposed to govern them immediately, but was supposed to have committed all Judgment to the Son, S. Job. v. 22. And therefore the ἐπιφάνειαι or Apparitions of the Deity in the Old Testament are generally in the New Testament supposed to have been of the Λόγος, the Father being conceived to dwell in the Light unapproachable, whom no Man either hath seen, or can see and live. Accordingly they who tempted God in the Wilderness are said to have tempted Christ, 1 Cor. x. 9. and elsewhere to grieve his Holy Spirit. That Spirit which, in this Reasoning, is supposed to immortalize to Punishment. So also Christ is said to have preached to the Spirits in prison, in the days of Noah, 1 S. Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20. as is commonly conceived. Those Spirits, as I have shewn in my Discourse concerning Marriages, were the Descendents of Seth, who were supposed to have been restored to the Spirit which Adam lost by his Fall. And this was, in this way of Reasoning, conceived sufficient to make the Injury rebound to Christ whose Spirit they had received, and (upon their Fall) to immortalize them to Punishment. These, by the
New

New Testament Reasonings, are concerned in the last Judgment. But where does the *New Testament* suppose that *they* shall be concerned in it, who knew nothing of *Christ*, or the Λόγος, or of any Concern they had with him? Your *Texts*, I think, prove no such matter. The *Children of the Kingdom*, S. *Matth.* viii. 12. were not only *Jews*, who had a *Title* to the *Spirit* in *Reversion*, which was sufficient to qualify them for that higher degree of *Punishment*, of the οὐκ ἐξάνεον, the same with τὰς τρεῖς, proper for those only of a *Divine Nature*; but were such of them also as had *heard* and *rejected* the *Preaching* of the *Gospel*. For such only were *cast out*, by the *Apostles* casting off the *Dust* of their *Feet* for a *Testimony* against them. As for your other Text, *Acts* xvii. 31. of *God's* judging the *World* in *Righteousness*; the *Apostle's* *Design* is fully answered, if it fully reached the *Case* to which the *Apostle* applies it, that is, of all those to whom he was then *Preaching*. And they to be sure had *heard* the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*; nor does the *Word* *World* necessarily imply any larger Signification. The *Apostles* were the *Light* of the *World*, S. *Matth.* v. 14. most certainly not of that part of the *World* which lived *before*, and could not therefore bear their *Instructions*, nor receive them as conveyed by *Tradition*. So the *Pharisees* observe that the whole

whole World was gone after our Saviour, S. Joh. xii. 19. Here it was impossible that any more could be meant than *they* who lived in our Saviour's time, and heard his Preaching. Yet even *they* are called, not only the World, but the whole World, which is a more comprehensive Expression than that which is used in your Text. Your Text, Hebr. 10. 27. wants the universal Particle, on which your Argument is grounded. The words are, *καὶ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἀποκτενεῖ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ τὸ τῦτο κτεῖναι.* Nor does the Force of the Apostle's Argument require it. The Emphasis lies on the Particle ἀπαξ, that is sufficient to shew what the Apostle collects in the following Verse: That it was not requisite for Christ, as a Man, do die any more than once: But that, as other Men, after that one Death, were to be judged; so Christ also, after his passage through that one Death, had no further part of his Mediatorial Office to be performed by him, but that of his share in the Judgment, that of a Judge on the Tribunal, not that of Ordinary Men, as Criminals at the Bar. The whole stress of this Argument lies on these two things: that the Death was to be but once, and that Judgment was to follow after it. Not in the least on the Universality, either of the Death or the Judgment. You mistake my Sentiments concerning the Jews, as if I did not think

think them liable to *Eternal Punishments*, as well as the *Christians*. They who heard the *Gospel* might, as I have shewn, very justly be obliged to chuse *Eternal Rewards*, under Pain of *Eternal Punishments*. And they who lived before the *Gospel*, and could not hear, yet, as they were intitled to the *Spirit in Reversion*, so might be intitled to the *Consequences* of the *Spirit*; one of which was to make them *immortal* in the State to which they should be intitled by the Use of their *Free Will*, whatever that State was, whether of *Reward* or *Punishment*.

And really the Revelations of the New Testament are very clear in owning a very great difference in the *Punishment* of those who should resist and reject the *Gospel*, from what it would have been, if they had never heard of the *Gospel*. What else can be the meaning of those plain Words of *St. Paul*? *The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by the man whom he hath ordained, Acts xviii. 30, 31.* So the same Apostle elsewhere; *Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, xiv. 16.* The Words are, *καὶ πάντες* and *ἐάνθρωποι* which could not properly be used on this Occasion, if God had obliged all other Nations, as well as the *Peculium*,

4.
The Scripture plainly supposes a great difference between the Punishment of them who never had heard of the Gospel, and those who had heard of, and rejected it.

culium, to worship *himself*, before he had revealed his Pleasure to them : And if he had resolved to *punish* them for not doing so, with *Eternal Torments*. The Words do rather plainly imply the contrary ; That while the Supreme God was ἀγνωστος, (that is plainly the ἀγνοια alluded to) God would *excuse* them from that *Duty*, on Account of that *Ignorance* of what otherwise would have been their *Duty*, if it had been *required* from *them*, and they had *known* that the Supreme Being had *required* it. But that God was for the *future* pleased to *insist* on it ; and that they must not *hereafter* [νῦν, from the time the *Apostle* as God's *Herald* promulged this *New Law* : So that they could not hence-forward *pretend* the like *Ignorance*,] I say, that they must not *hereafter* expect the like *Indulgence* as was allowed them *before*. It is plainly *proclaiming* God's Pleasure in a Case of which they were *ignorant before*, that God would *judge* the *World*, and that our Blessed Lord was appointed for the *Judge* to whom they must give up their Accounts. This agrees *exactly* with the Account our Lord himself gives of that Judgment ; that he would reckon all the *good* and *ill* Offices of *all* that should appear before him, as offered to *himself*. And, upon this *new Authentic Publication* of God's Pleasure, he farther declares, That they must not look on this

this *New Law*, as formerly, as concerning only his own People the *Jews*, but all *Men*; nor as confined to *Palæstine*, and the several *Residences* of the *Jewish Colonies*, but as obliging every where; and that all *Mankind* should receive the *Gospel* revealed by *Christ*, as they would answer the contrary at their *Peril*, when they should appear before his *Tribunal*, at that *Day* which *God* hath appointed for judging them. This *Reasoning* plainly supposes their *Concern* in that *Judgment*, to commence from the *Time* of the *Promulgation* of this *New Law*; from which time their *Ignorance* could not pretend to be *invincible*. So far it is from supposing every *Individual Man* to be concerned in it. And indeed the *Scripture* does every where suppose the Condition of those who resist the *Gospel-Dispensation*, worse than those of the worst sort of *Criminals* who never heard of the *Gospel*. So *St. Peter*; *It had been better for them not to have known the way of Righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy Commandment delivered unto them*: 2 *St. Pet.* ii. 21. This is the same *Ignorance*, and the same *Commandment* now mentioned by *St. Paul*. Thus the Condition of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, and even of *Sodom*, is said to be more tolerable in the *Day of Judgment*, than that of *Chorazin*, and *Bethsaida*, and *Capernaum*; where our Saviour had

had done his *mighty Works*, attesting his *Authority* for publishing this *New Commandment*, S. Matth. xi. 21, 22, 23, 24. S. Luk. x. 12, 13, 14, 15. This *Tolerableness* must relate rather to the *Evils*, than the *Excusableness* of their *Case*; in regard of the greater *Evidence* used for reclaiming the *one*, than the *other*. And the *Case* is clear upon these *Principles*, that the *Punishment* of the $\Psi\chi\alpha$, and of those who were only *Physical*, would not extend to the *outer Darkness*, and the *nethermost Hell*, which was to be the *Share* of those who were *Pneumatical*. And our *Saviour* seems to *allude* to it in these words; *And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell.* Intimating, that the *Capernaïtes* *Capacities* of *Heaven*, by having the *Gospel* *Preached* to them, was the very *Consideration* that made them *liable* to the *Punishment* of *Hell*; which *they* had no *reason* to *fear* who never had received that *Favour* from *God*, which might have entitled them to *extraordinary* and *supernatural* *Rewards*.

5.
Unbe-
lievers are
the Per-
sons de-
signed in
the Scri-
ptures for

To this purpose serve those many *Texts* that are commonly observed, yet for *another* purpose, that make *Hell*, in a *peculiar* way, the *Reward* of *Unbelievers*. So, *He that believeth not, shall be damned*, S. Matth.

Eternal Punishments; who must therefore be supposed to have heard of the *Gospel*,

xvi. 16. This is plainly spoken of *disbelieving the Gospel, when preached*. And the *αἰτίαι* relates to the *αἰτίαι* which belongs to our Lord, as Judge at the last Judgment. So, *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the only-begotten Son of God*, S. Joh. iii. 18. By ranking themselves among those whom he has already declared as belonging to his *Left Hand*. So, *He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him*, vers. 36. *That they all might be damned, who believe not the Truth*, 2 Thess. ii. 12. So Hell is called the *Portion of Unbelievers*, S. Luk. xii. 46. *But the fearful and unbelievers, and the abominable and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death*, Rev. xxi. 8. That other *Criminals* are added here, to shew, that even the *Profession of the True Communion* will not secure Persons guilty of such *flagitious Sins* from the *Portion of Unbelievers*, if they add not a farther Care of securing themselves by their *Repentance*. But the *Unbelief* here spoken of, is not the *fiducial Recumbency* on the *Mercies of Christ*, as they fancy who are fullest of the Texts that mention it; but the *disbelief of the Revelations of the Gospel*, when-

when-ever they are sufficiently proposed. So the Scriptures themselves explain it: *In flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, 2 Thess. i. 8, 9. What shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God? 1 S. Pet. iv. 17. Unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the Truth, but obey Unrighteousness; indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every Soul of Man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile, Rom. ii. 8, 9. Thus it is that the $\pi\sigma\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\omicron\iota$ take in all of the two opposite $\eta\gamma\iota\omega\upsilon\iota\alpha$ of Righteousness and Unrighteousness, of Light and Darkness, of Christ and Belial, of God and Idols, 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15, 16. So S. Paul, and S. John in his first Epistle, supposes all who are out of the true Communion, for that very Reason, to be in a State of Error and Darkness, and Death. The Darkness is that of which the Devil is the Prince and Ruler. And the Death is the second Death. Thus therefore it appears, that in the Scripture-Reasoning, the Faithful and Unfaithful, exactly answer the two States concerned in the general Judgment, on the Right Hand and the Left, as headed by Christ, and his Adversary the Devil,*

Devil, as *Generals* of two *Armies* in *Hostility* against each other. The *Infidelity* therefore here meant, could not be a pure *Negative non-belief*, but a *Criminal disbelief* of the *Gospel*, when *preach'd* to them, and *attested* by its *extraordinary Credentials*. By this Men came to be *formed* into these two opposite *Parties*. They who *received* the *Gospel*, and were accordingly received into the *Church* by the *Sacramental Symbols*, were supposed to belong to *Christ*, and to that *Body* of which he was the *Head*. They who *opposed* it, or would not be *Profelyted* by it, whatever *else* they *believed*, or to whomsoever they were *joyned*, they were, by the *Christians*, reckoned as belonging to the opposite *Party* to *Christ*, which was headed by the *Devil*. If therefore their *disbelief* of the *Gospel* was the *Cognizance* by which this *Party* was distinguished, it could consist of *none* but such as had *heard* and *rejected* the *Gospel*; and therefore could include *none* but such as *lived* under the *Gospel*, at least of those who were *not* Originally of the *Old Peculium*. It is the *Apostle's Reasoning*: *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?* Rom. x. 14. The same *Reasoning* holds here. It is as *impossible* to *disbelieve*, as to *believe* in him of whom they had not *heard*, or to *hear* of him without a *Preacher*. None there-

Occasion,
Comm.

therefore can be concerned in the Sentence to that Hell which was prepared for the Devil and his Angels, but they who hear of the Gospel, if none but Disbelievers of the Gospel be concerned in it. And this fully agrees with what I have observed already, of the form of that Judgment, as our Saviour has described it. And it also fully answers the whole design of the Apostles, as often as they insist on this same Topick, to oblige those with whom they dealt (who either were Profelytes, or designed for such) to Act conformably to the Injunctions of the Gospel.

6.

The place
of S. Joh.
v. 28, 29.
answered.

But there is a passage which may be thought decisive in this case. It is in the Words of our Saviour: *The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation, S. Joh. v. 28, 29.* Here all that are in the Graves are said expressly to have their shares in one of the two Final Sentences of the last General Judgment: either the Resurrection of Life, or the other Resurrection of Damnation. If these words were to be understood in the Universality they might imply, if no regard were had to the occasion of them: I might then be inclinable to believe that all men, who had not heard of the Gospel in this Life, might

might be admitted to the favour of having it *preached* to them in their *separate* state, in order to the rendring them *unexcusable* at the *general Judgment*. But there is indeed *no reason* to understand them as intended by our Saviour himself to *mean* so *universally*. It is usual with these Eastern Writers especially, to use these *large expressions*, when they mean no more by them than was requisite for the *occasion* on which they use them. The *Gibeonites* tell *David*, on occasion of the *Famine* for breach of *Faith* to themselves, by *Saul*, That they would have *no silver nor gold* of *Saul*, nor of *his house*, neither for them should he kill any man in *Israel*. These Words are as *universal* as the Words we are now concern'd for. Yet they immediately demand *seven* of *Saul's Posterity* to be delivered to them to be put to death, 2 *Sam.* xxi. 4, 6, 9. So *Obadiah* concerning his Master *Ahab's* diligence in enquiring for the Prophet *Elijah*: As the Lord thy God liveth, there is no Nation or Kingdom, whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, he is not here; he took an Oath of the Kingdom and Nation, that they found thee not, 1 *King* xviii. 10. Yet none can think that he meant it of any other Nations or Kingdoms but those only which bordered on his own Kingdom of the *Ten Tribes*. So *S. Paul*, I thank God that I baptized none of you, but

The Distinction between

Crispus and Gaius, 1 Cor. i. 14. Yet he afterwards owns that he had Baptized others: *And I baptized also the household of Stephanus: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other*, v. 16. So God granted to S. Paul all that sailed with him, *Act. xxvii. 24.* Yet it was on that condition, that they all would abide in the Ship, v. 31. In this Case God himself was concerned; but as acting according to the known and allowed Rules of *Veracity* in dealings between man and man. So the Spies at Jericho gave their Faith to *Rahab* for the security of her and her Family, *Josh. ii 14.* But upon conditions afterwards mention'd, v. 17, 18, 20. In all these places *Limitations* were intended, though the words were indefinite, or general, not intimating any *Limitations*. Nothing therefore can be concluded from the *Universality* of the Expressions in this present place. And it was perfectly satisfactory to our Saviour's Design, if all those who heard him preach those Words should rise out of their Graves, and should be adjudged to one of those States of a *Resurrection to Life*, or a *Resurrection to Damnation*. That was sufficient to oblige his Auditors to embrace his Doctrine on both the inducements, by which Law makers secure the Obedience of their Subjects, of Rewards and Punishments. And I have withal shewn it agreeable to our Saviour's design in the places now mention'd, that

that he should *not* mean these Words in a larger sense than this of those who had heard of the Gospel.

This, I conceive, worthy Sir, sufficient to shew that this Doctrine is not indeed so *Antiscriptural* as you suppose. And no more can be required according to the *usual* ways of proving Doctrines *Scriptural*: But it very much confirms me in my Reasonings of this kind, when I find an *Interpretation* of the *Scriptures* not only agreeable to the Words of the *Scriptures*; but agreeable also to the *Notions* and *Significations* of Words, and Reasonings then received. For that sense which was most likely to be then understood, was, in all *likelihood* the *true* sense intended by the Holy Ghost *himself*. * Other-
 * *vid. Proleg. Apolog. ad D. Stearn. de Obstinat.ione.*
 wise there could be no security that his *true* Sense could be conveyed to *future* Ages, if they had been *themselves* mistaken in it, to whose *understanding* the *Holy Ghost* was then particularly concern'd to accommodate himself. I say, if even *they* were *mistaken*, who were to be presumed the most *Authentic* *Originals*, and who were necessarily the *only* Persons who could be *intrusted* with the faithful *Conveyance* of what *themselves* had received for the use of their *Posterity*. And indeed, I am not *Conscious* of any thing, in the *Hypothesis* now mentioned, that is not perfectly *consistent* with the *Sentiments* of that *Age* wherein the *Gospel* was preached

preached by the *Apostles*, and the *Books* of the *Sacred Canon* were written. The *Rab- bins* mention their *Nephefsh*, *Ruach*, and *Ne- shamah*, answering the three *Parts* in *Man* in the *New Testament*, of *Body*, *Soul* and *Spirit*. But I confess, I am not confident of any thing delivered by *them* as a *Tradi- tion* so *antient* as the *Apostolical Age*. But *Plato* is clear in the distinction of *Nūs* or *Λό- γος* from *Ψυχῇ*, and allows it to be so great that the former could be the product of none but the *Supreme Being*, who could make nothing *mortal* or *corruptible*: and and that the *latter* was left to the *inferior Demiurgical Deities*, who could make no- thing *immortal* and *incorruptible*. So he in his *Timæus*. And it is very notorious how much *that* Philosophy was received in the *Apostolical Age*, even among the *Jews* them- selves, and how many of their *terms* are alluded to, not only in *Philo* and *Josephus* and the *Apocryphal Hellenists*, but in the *New Testament* also. The precarious fancy of *Des Cartes*, who makes every *Cause* of *Motion* *distinct* from *Matter* to be *properly* what we call a *Spirit*, *independent* on *Mat- ter*, and *Immortal*, was not (that we know of) *thought* of by any; and is therefore, at least very improper for explaining *Rea- sonings* of *Times*, when it was *not* *thought True*, so far they were *then* from *Reasoning* from it, and I pray, what *difference* is there

there between those *Platonical* Notions, and those of the *New Testament*, but that the *Sacred Writers* more frequently call that πνεῦμα which the *Platonists* call λογῶν or Nōs. The reason of that difference is manifest, because the *Scripture* ascribes that *Superiour Power* in *Man* to a *Divine Breathing*, *Gen. ii. 7.* Yet even that very name from *breathing* is own'd by the *Heathens*, when they call the *Soul*, *Divinae particulam anræ*, and the very name of *anima* or *animus* is from ἀνέμῳ. And *Seneca* uses the very word of the *New Testament* for that which he calls a *God* in *Man*, as the *Scripture* does *Eph. 41.* *Philo*, as nearer to the *Apóstles*, whilst they were under the prejudices of their *Jewish Education*, comes also nearer to them in this very *Expression*. He distinguishes clearly this πνεῦμα θεῶν infused by *God's Breathing*, from the *sensible formed Man*, which he makes to consist of *Body* and *Soul*, yet both *Mortal*. His words concerning that lower part of *Man* are; ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλαθεῖς ἥδη αἰσθητός — ἐκ σώ- ματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστώς, ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή, φύσει θνητός ὢν. Yet by the benefit of that πνεῦμα θεῶν he owns that the more ignoble part also is made *Immortal*. He says, it was sent hither, as to a *Colony*, ἐπ' ὀφελεία τῷ γένει ἡμῶν, ἵν' εἰς θνητὸν ὄσι κατὰ τὴν ἀσθενείαν, κατὰ τὴν τὴν ἀσθενείαν ἀθανάτισθαι. So far by him the *Two Men*, the *Earthly* and the

De Mund.

Op. p. 30,

31,

Heavenly are distinctly express'd; the *Platonists* also are as plain. They make also all *Earthly* things to have their *παρὰδείγματα* their *ιδέας*, their *εἰκονάς* answering them in the *Mundus vultus*, the *Intellectual Sun*, the very same with their *Λόγος*. And they own the same difference between them, that the *Celestial Archetypes* were supposed *Incorruptible* and *Immortal*: The *Earthly Ectypes* no otherwise than as they received their *ὑπόμνησιν* their *Heavenly Original*, and, together with it, a participation of *Immortality* also. On the same Principles the *ἄνθρωποι κατὰ μέτρον* were to receive together with their *τύποις*, their *Immortality* also, from the *αὐτοάνθρωπος* or *ἄνθρωπος ὑσιώδης*, which they placed in the *Λόγος*, exactly as our *Sacred Writers* do of the *New Testament*. This gives a clear account how all *Humane Immortality* must be derived from our *Blessed Lord*, as the *Λόγος*; and that none can pretend to it, who cannot shew their title to it, by their title to *Him*, as our *New Testament Writers* suppose. *Philo* owns the same distinction of the *Two Men* elsewhere. That is not all, He, as conversant in the *Scripture*, owns the very name of *Adam* as common to both these *Men*. And what does the *Apostle* more, excepting his application of it to our *Christ*, whom *Philo*, as a *Jew*, did not acknowledge, either to be the *Christ*, or the *Λόγος*?

How-

Alleg. l. i.
p. 49, 50.
56, 57, &c.
§. 7.

However, by this *Philosophical Hypothesis*, it was from the Λόγος that these *exiled minds*, φυγάδες θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήται, were supposed to fall. And it was accordingly thought the Office of the same Λόγος, to restore them to their former dignity, by restoring that *Diviner Principle* to which they had been entitled, as *Descendents* from Adam, if Adam had not disabled himself for deriving it to them by losing it himself. This Λόγος or Νῆς, was taken by Plato for the *Wing* of the Soul, which enabled it to mount above the *subcelestial* Regions to Heaven, which whatsoever Soul wanted, it was thereby disabled to recover its former Station. And it was taken for the Office of the Λόγος, to send down those new *Coloni*, as *Philo* calls them, which added to well disposed Souls, might enable them to recover Heaven from whence they were supposed to have fallen. This was therefore taken for a *Divine Nature* (as *S. Peter* himself calls it, 2 Ep. i. 4.) as it made them *Immortal*, and as it raised them to the place of the Gods in the lower sense of the Word. So those Gods are described by their Worshipers, that their dwelling is not with flesh, Dan. ii. 11. And by *Homer*, That they are Ὀλύμπια σώματ' ἔχοντες. And the Λόγος was then to take care of sending down this *Celestial Colony*, when he was to undertake the πρὸς ἀδίου (that is *Plato's* word) the Helm

Helm of the World in his own Person, which was supposed to be at the beginning of the *Golden Age*. This is therefore the *Novus Progenies* from *Heaven*, in *Virgil*, *Eclog.* 3. And the sending down these, is the reason why the *Gods* were supposed to be so familiar with *Men* in the *Golden Age*, because the *Men* then living were supposed generally to have enjoyed this *Divine Spirit*. On this account it is that *S. Paul* quotes the *Heathen Poet Aratus* with Approbation: Τὸ δὲ ἔστι γένεσθαι. For so it follows immediately: Γένεσθαι ἐν ὑπαρχούσας τῷ θεῷ &c. He Reasons upon it, not only as granted by those with whom he was then disputing, but as really *True*.

8. Thus then it appears that this *Divine Spirit* entitled them who had it to a state of *Immortality*, in the opinion of those Times, at least of Rewards. Yet even this *Divine Seed* was thought to be *τεπλὴς φύσεως*, and such as might, by the ill use of their *Free-Will*, not only deserve, but incur, Punishment. And in that Case, if the Punishment was not limited to a certain time, it might be equal to their own duration, and therefore *Eternal* also. So it was supposed to be in the Case of *Saturn*. So in the Case of the *Titans*, and the *Rebel Giants*, condemned for their Wars against the *Gods*, when all were thought to be *Gods* on account of their *Divine* Extraction. So, in relation to

It is also agreeable to those Heathen Originals from whence the Phrases of the N. T. concerning this matter are derived.

to the *Jewish Hellenists*, in the Case of the *Giants*, which were born to the *Sons* of God by the *Daughters* of *Men*, and of these *Sons* of God themselves, who are called *Angels* by *S. Jude*, who are said to have left their own *οὐρανίου*, and to have fallen from their *ἀρχή*, the Dignity wherein they had been created, and are reckoned among *Fleshly Sinners*. So also in the Case of the first fallen *Angel* who tempted our first Parents long before that Defection that occasioned the *Deluge*. These were all *Encumbrances*, either *unmixt* as the *Angels*; or *mixt* as the *Giants*, who answered the *Heathen Heroes* or *Semidei*, being *Divine*, as they descended from the *Sons* of *Seth*, and purely *Humane*, as being born by the *Daughters* of *Cain*, who had no pretensions to this *Divine Spirit*. These are the *Spirits* in *Prison*, 1 *S. Pet.* iii. 19. As being *Prisoners*, is the same with being *bound*, *Act.* xxiii. 18. xxv. 14. xxvi. 29. So the *Apostate Angels* are said to be *bound* in the Book of *Tobit* and *S. Peter*, and the *Apo-cryphal Book* of *Enoch* and the *Revelations*. And that in *Chains* of *Darkness*. In them they are said to be *reserved* to the Judgment of the *Great Day*. The Book of *Enoch* seems also here alluded to, as also the *Heathen Traditions* of *Saturn's* being also *bound*, mention'd in *Plutarch*. The Book of *Enoch* mentions a *Day* wherein they were to be Judged.

Judged. Then they are to be sentenced to *Fire*, to *Flaming* and *Eternal Fire*, to *Tartarus*, that *nethermost Hell*, the *deepest* part of *Hades*, as it is described in *Hesiod*, from whom, and the like *Heathen Poets*, the Word is taken in the *New Testament*. This was the place for *Immortal Criminals*, and never mention'd as *intended* for *Ordinary Souls* in the *Poets*, from whose use the Word is taken. And the *New Testament* implies it, when it tells us that it was *prepared* for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, who were all undoubtedly owned for *Spiritual*. That ordinary *Humane Souls* should be *Spiritualized*, and should be thereby entitled to *Eternal Punishments*, was a thing *unknown* before; and was first notified by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. These *New Revelations* therefore declared that *God* had *appointed* that *Day*, which before they only thought *probable* by *Humane Reasonings*: and that all that *heard* the *Gospel* should be *concerned* in it, which none but those *Fallen Angels*, and the *Giants* their *Off-spring*, were thought concern'd in before; and that they who were understood to have taken the *Devil's* part, by *not* joyning with our *Blessed Lord*, upon the *publication* of his *Pleasure*, requiring them to joyn *Him*, should be so far *Spiritualized* as was requisite to entitle them to *Immortal Punishments*, should share in those Punishments which were *not* prepared for

for them, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, to whom they had joyned *themselves* in *opposition* to our *Lord*? and that our *Blessed Lord*, whom they had provoked by *joyning* with his *Adversary*, was by *God* himself appointed to be the *Judge* that should pass the Sentence, as well against his *Capital Enemies*, as their *Accomplices*. Hence it is that our *Blessed Saviour* himself, in his Parable concerning his own *Marriage* with his *Church*, sentences those who should come to it without the *Wedding Garment*, to be *bound hand and foot*, and *cast into outer darkness*, where there should be *weeping and gnashing of teeth*, S. *Matth.* xxii. 13. This seems plainly to intimate their sharing with those *Devils* in their *Punishment*, whose *part* they had espoused, by *rejecting* the *Gospel* when it was *preached* to them. The *binding* seems to be design'd in order to it. They are *bound* as the *Devils* were. And with the same *design* of *casting* them into the *Fire*, prepared for the *Devils*, as the Three Children were *bound* when they were cast into the *Fiery Furnace*. They are therefore said to be *chained*, to shew the *Confinement* of these *Spiritual* Natures from that *Freedom* which their *own* Nature would allow them, if they had been left to it, and had *not* been *chained*. And the *Chains* are called *Chains of Darkness*, to let us know that it was to the *darkness* of those *Sublunary Regions*,

gions in opposition to the *Light* of those that are *Celestial*, to which they are opposed in *Scripture*. These *Chains* therefore suppose these Beings so *chained* to have a *Heavenly* and *Divine* Ingredient in their *Natural* Constitution, which would have enabled them to aspire to the *Heavenly* Regions of *Light*, if they had not been *confined* to those *darker* Regions by those *Chains*. Yet even these *Chains* do not confine them to the *Tartarus*, for which they were reserved. When our Saviour was dispossessing him who had the *Legion*, the *Devils* tell him of tormenting them *before* their *Time*, S. *Matth.* viii. 29. What they meant by that, is explain'd in the same Narrative by S. *Luke*, that it was, his sending them into the *Abyss*, S. *Luke* viii. 31. That *Abyss* is the same mention'd in *Genes.* i. 2. where *Darkness* is said to be on the face of the *Abyss*. So in the LXXII, and the *Vulgar Latin*. So it answers the Poets *Chaos*, as that also includes *Tartarus*, as well as others of the *infernal* Regions. And here it seems to be the *outer darkness*, that has *another darkness* upon the face of it. And so the *Gnosticks* seem to have understood it in their *Fragments*, at the end of *Clement Alexandrinus*. This plainly supposes them not yet in that *darkness* which is designed for their *Punishment* till the *time* appointed for it, the *Day of Judgment*. Their present place

place therefore is the *Darkness* that is nearest the *Heavens*, the Regions of *Light*. That therefore it is taken for a Confinement for them to be here, it shews that Heaven was the ἰδίον οἰκητήριον from which they fell, and the place proper for their *Spiritual Nature*. And this the Scripture acknowledges when it styles them πνεύματα, though it is usually with the Epithet of ἀνθρώπινα. When therefore *Humane Souls* are made ἱσάγγελοι by the Addition of this *adscititious Spirit*, they are then qualified for this higher degree of *Punishment*. And being so qualified, *Christ* judges it fit, that they should share with them in it, having joined with them in their common Rebellion against his Authority. But this could only concern those Souls, whose Nature had been exalted and improved by the Accession of this *adscititious Spirit*. Others were not ἱσάγγελοι in Nature, and therefore not so qualified to share in the *Punishment* of *lapsed Angels*. Thus it appears to me, that this Hypothesis is really more *Scriptural*, than any other advanced in Opposition to it, from the Consent of modern Ages.

But you oppose to it the *Principles*, you are pleased to call *Catholick*, of the Souls *Immortality*. And I am very willing to be convinc'd by any *Principles* truly *Catholick*; yet I shall not confine you to that

Notion

9.
This Doctrine is owned by S. Justin Martyr.

Notion of Catholick, which belongs properly to the Archetypal Church in Heaven, as I think I have proved in my Parænesis. I am content with that Consent of particular Churches, which may be a solid Argument for proving a Doctrine delivered from the Apostles. But I must needs say, I do not think that the Consent of all, or the greatest part, of particular Churches now, at this distance we live in, from the Apostles, is such an Argument. The Protestants took many Doctrines as they found them, without examining them from Originals, when no use of them in the Controversies then disputed, suggested any Reasons for distrusting them. The two great Bodies of the Greeks and the Romanists had for many of the intermediate Ages, allowed new Revelations since the Apostles times, and new Credentials of Miracles for recommending them, and had agreed on so precarious Proofs of both kinds, as put it perfectly in their Power to introduce what new Revelations they pleased of Doctrines unknown to the Apostles, and to make their own Bodies unanimous in them, by Principles received by both of them, and not concerned in their Differences in Communion from each other. Their Agreement therefore in any Doctrine, as received from the Apostles, can be no certain Argument to prove that it really was so, at least, since the time they

they have taken up, and agreed in these *false Criteria*. If we allow of no *new Doctrinal Revelations*, but what were made to the *Apostles*, we can allow of no *Consent* of *particular Churches*, as an *Argument* to prove a *Doctrine* true, but such a *Consent* as could not possibly have been, unless the *Doctrine* had been really revealed to the *Apostles*, and been faithfully conveyed from them. This I am willing to be determined by as it is managed by *Tertullian* and *Vincentius Lorinenfis*, but especially by *Tertullian*. The nearer the better, and the more impossible it was for *Bishops* to have been *unanimous* in a *Change* when they were equal, and none had Authority sufficient to oblige his *Colleagues* to change with him. Yet even here also I confess them *unanimous* in asserting the *actual* Survival of *Souls*, after the Dissolution of their Bodies. All I deny is, that they asserted it *Immortal* of its own nature, or that its continued Survival was for ever, without a new *Indulgence* of *God*, above what he had granted them at their *Creation*. Against this I oppose *S. Justin Martyr*, this good old Man, or *Genius* (in whose person he speaks what himself believes true) blames *Plato* expressly, for asserting your *Doctrine* of the *Soul's* natural *Immortality*. He tells us expressly, in opposition to him; Οὐδὲ μὴ ἀθάνατον καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ. *Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 222.*

He gives this plain account of God's disposal of *Human Souls*: Αἱ μὲν ἄξια τῷ θεῷ φα-
 νείσθαι ἐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἐτι· αἱ δὲ κολλάσθαι
 ἐς' αὐτὰς καὶ Εἶναι καὶ κολλάζεσθαι ὁ θεὸς
 διὰ τὴν π. 223. He makes their *Existence*,
 as well as the *Duration* of their *Punishment*,
 to depend on the *Divine* arbitrary *Pleasure*.
 So that the *Eternity* of the *Punishment* of
 the *Wicked* themselves, how much soever
 contrary to their own *Desires*, is not (ac-
 cording to him) imputable to their *Nature*,
 but God's *Will* that it should be so *actually*.
 So he had told us just before: Ἀλλὰ μὴ
 εὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκουσιν φημι πάσαις τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγώ
 ἱρμαίον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς. Plainly
 implying, that though all *Souls* did *not*,
 yet *some* did *actually* die, even according to
 his own *Opinion*, which must therefore
 have been exactly the *same* with that you
 think so hardly of. He accordingly applies
 what *Plato* in his *Timæus* says concerning
 the *World*, to this case of *Human Souls*,
 and all other Beings distinct from *God* him-
 self: Ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν καὶ φθαρτὸς ἐστὶν ἢ γέγονεν,
 καὶ λυθήσεται· ὃ, εὐδὲ τεύξεσθαι θανάτου μοίραι,
 διὰ τὴν βέλεσιν τῷ θεῷ; τὸ αὐτὸ τοῖς δοκεῖ καὶ
 περὶ ΨΥΧΗΣ καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντων περὶ
 λέγεσθαι; ὅσα γὰρ ὅτι μετὰ τὸ θεόν, ἢ ἐστὶ
 πῶς, ταῦτα φύσιν φθαρτὴν ἔχειν, καὶ οἷά τε ἐξ-
 αφανισθῆναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι. Μόνον γὰρ ἀγνώ-
 ρητος καὶ ἀφθαρτος ὁ θεός, καὶ διὰ τούτου θεός ὅτι
 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα μετὰ τούτον γεννητὰ καὶ φθαρτὰ.
 Τούτου

Τὺτε χάριν καὶ ἈΦΘΝΗ' ΣΚΟΤΕΙΝ
Αἶ' ΨΥΧΑΙ' καὶ κολάζονται. It is particu-
lar, with regard to *Human Souls*, that the
Mortality he ascribes to them, is such as is
not generally prevented by God himself; but
may actually take place in those Cases
wherein the contrary Doctrine is of the
harshest Consequence, that of *unbaptized In-*
*fant*s, and of those who never heard of the
Gospel. And this *Mortality* is not meant
mystically, in reference to the Enjoyment of
God; but literally, as appears from the
Places now transcribed, of a *ceasing to be*.
He applies it expressly to their *Being*. And
it is their *ceasing to be*, that he owns to be
so *beneficial* to the *wicked*, as the Scripture
does also. So again; Ζῶνς ὁ ψυχὴ μετέχει,
ἐπεὶ ζῆν αὐτὴν ὁ Θεὸς βούλεται ὅπως ἀρα καὶ ὁ
μετέχει πότε, ὅταν αὐτὴν μὴ θέλοι ζῆν. p. 224.
That is not all, He ascribes this *Death* of
the *Soul* to the same Cause as I have done;
from S. Paul, the *Desertion* of it by the
Spirit. So it follows afterwards: As the
Man dies when the *Soul* leaves the *Body*;
ὅπως καὶ ὅταν δέη τὴν ψυχὴν μηκέτι ΕἶΝΑΙ,
ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὸ ΖΩΤΙΚΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ψυχὴ τι, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ ὅθεν ἐλή-
φθη, οὐκέτι χωρεῖ πάλιν. This ζῶνικόν πνεύ-
μα is the very same, and has the very same
Effects ascribed to it, as the πνεῦμα ζωοποι-
όν in S. Paul. So S. Justin.

II.
And by
Tatian.

The same also is the Doctrine of his Disciple *Tatian*, a little after his Master's *Martyrdom*. His words are as plain to this purpose, as those of his glorious Master; *ἐκ ἑστίν αἰαίαι*, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, ἡ ψυχὴ κατ' ἐαυτὴν, θνήτῃ δέ. Ἀλλὰ δύναται ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ μὴ ἀποθνήσκειν. Θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ λύεται μετὰ τῷ Σώματι, μὴ γινώσκουσα τὴν ἀληθειαν, ἀνίσταται δὲ εἰς ὑψέρον ἐπὶ Συντελείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου σὺν τῷ σώματι θάνατον διὰ τιμωρίας ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα. Πάλιν τε β' θνήσκει, καὶν πρὸς καιρὸν λυθῇ, καὶ ἐπιγινώσιν τῷ θεῷ πεποιημένη. Orat. ad Græc. § 21. Ed. Oxon. Withal he owns it due to the Spirit, that it does not actually dye. So afterwards: *Ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐκ αὐτῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσωσεν, ἔσωθη δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῆς*. § 22. Again: *Κυζυγίαν δὲ κεκτημένην τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος, ἐκ ἑστίν ἀβοήθητος*. *Ἀνέρχεται δὲ πρὸς ἅπερ αὐτὴν ὁδηγῆσαι χωρεῖα τὸ πνεῦμα*. *Τῷ μὲν γὰρ ὅστις ἄνω τὸ οἰκητήριον*. The *Κοίτη* is taken from *ὕλη*, the *World*; and the *οἰκητήριον* above is the same mentioned by *S. Jude*, as lost by the fallen Angels. He makes the Desertion of the Spirit the Cause of this Death: *Ἐπὶ ῥωσὶς καὶ ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ τέλειον ὅπερ ἀπορρίψασα, διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπὶ ὥσπερ νεόστος γὰρ χαμαιπετὴς ἐγένετο*. § 34. The Language here is that of *Plato*. He therefore makes it the Duty of those who would recover the Conjunction with God, which Mankind has lost (for he had owned the

first

first Man to have had it, § 22.) to retrieve this Union with the Spirit; *χρὴ λοιπὸν ἡμᾶς ὅπερ ἔχοντες ἀπολωλέκαμεν, τὸτο νῦν ἀναζητεῖν, ζευγνῦναι τε τῇ ψυχῇ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, καὶ τῇ κατὰ θεὸν συζυγίᾳ πραγματεύεσθαι.* § 24. And, as he ascribes our Salvation to this Communion with the Divine Spirit, so, on the contrary, he makes this κοινωνία with the Devil to entitle them, who are guilty of that κοινωνία, to share with the Devils in their Punishment. His words are; *Καθόπερ ὃ τῷ λησέοντι συνδεπνήσας, καὶ μὴ λησῆς αὐτὸς ἦ, ἀλλ' ὁμῶς, διὰ τὸ συνεστιαθῆναι, τιμωρίας μέταλαμβάνει τῷ τρόπῳ τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ μὴ κακὸς, τῷ ὃ φαύλῳ ἀναμιγρῆς, πρὸς τὸ νομιζόμενον κακὸν συγχρησάμενος, διὰ τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν κοινωνίᾳ, ὑπὸ τοῦ κρινόντος τῶτον θεὸς κολαθήσεται.* § 20. Thus far he agrees with his Master, and may therefore be more securely trusted, as a faithful Witness of what was not contradictory to Apostolical Tradition. His making the Souls, both of the Good and Evil, dye, in the interval between the Death of their Bodies and their Resurrection, we may look on as his Human Reasonings, when he was now disposed to introduce his Heresie, which he did soon after his Master's Death. But then he had less regard for truly Apostolical Traditions, and the true Catholick Church as a Witness of it.

II.
And S.
Irenæus.

S. Irenæus follows S. Justin Martyr, after whom he wrote, tho' he was born before him. He admits the Reasoning that S. Austin did, that whatever was γεννῆτος, must be φθάρτος; And therefore allows nothing to be ingenerable and incorruptible, but God. All other things therefore having had a beginning, he allows them no certain Duration, but according to the Pleasure of God: *Perseverant autem, & extenduntur ad longitudinem sæculorum, secundum voluntatem factoris Dei*, l. 81. c. 62. The Words are taken from the famous Passage of Plato in his *Timæus*, where the Perpetuity of Duration is expressly denied to them, on account of their Nature. He applies it to Souls and created Spirits themselves. And therefore adds concerning them also; *Perseverant autem quoadusque, eas Deus & esse & perseverare voluerit*. So, concerning our Life, he affirms; *Non enim ex nobis, neque ex nostrâ Naturâ vita est, sed secundum gratiam Dei datur*. He therefore subjoins, that he who is ingrateful and owns not his Benefactor, *ipse se privat in sæculum sæculi perseverantia*. Afterwards he has these Words; *Capit & animas primum non existentes dehinc perseverare, cum eas Deus & esse & subsistere voluerit*. He uses the Reasonings, and almost the Words of S. Justin. Though the Reasoning is Plato's, and he may seem to proceed on the

the *Platonick Hypothesis*, in those very Particulars wherein S. *Justin* owns himself of a *different Opinion* from *Plato*. He may seem to reckon the *Souls and Spirits* in one Rank, as if the *Soul's actual Immortality* were no more precarious, than that of the *Spirit*, which is directly contrary to the Doctrine of S. *Austin*. He seems to make them also *naturâ immortalia, quibus à suâ naturâ adest vivere*, l. v. c. 4. He denies that the *Soul dies*, l. v. c. 7. But it is upon a critical Notion of *Death*, as it signifies a ceasing to *breath*, which cannot properly belong to any thing but the *Body* which is, alone, that which properly *breaths*. Again v. 13. Οὐτε ὁ ἡ ψυχὴ θνήσκει, ἔτε τὸ ἀνθρώπου. But all he means by these Expressions, seems only to be, that the *Soul* does not actually die when the *Body* dies, and that, in its own *Nature*, it does not consist of contrary Principles, tending to a *Dissolution* by its own *Nature*, as the *Body* does. So he will not differ from S. *Justin*, but *Tatian*, as denying the actual *Death*, even of the *Soul*, though *Death* be indeed natural to it, on account of its natural Constitution. And so himself seems to explain himself, when, speaking of this *Immortality* of the *Soul and Spirit*, he has these Words; *perseverant immortalia, quoniam vivificantur à Patre*, l. v. c. 4. It is therefore the *perseverance in Life*, when the *Body* dies, that

he means by the *Soul's Immortality*. And it is the extrinsical *Favour* of the *Father*, not its own *Nature*, to which the *Soul* is beholden for that *perseverance in Being*, according to the Opinion of *S. Iræneus*. But a *perfect Man*, according to him, as well as the *Apostle*, includes all Three: *Perfectus homo commixtio & adunitio est animæ assumentis Spiritum Patris, & admixta ei carni, quæ est plasmata secundum imaginem Dei, v. 6.* Again: *Cum autem Spiritus hic commixtus animæ unitur plasmata, propter effusionem Spiritus Spiritualis & perfectus homo factus est; & hic est qui secundum imaginem & similitudinem factus est Dei.* And more he has in the same Place, to the same Purpose. All three are, with him, essential to the *spiritual Man*, who is qualified to be a *Member* of the new *Peculium*, whether he have extraordinary Gifts of the *Spirit* or not: He cannot otherwise be one *Spirit*, as well as one *Body*, with *Christ Mystical*. Indeed, if he have not the *Spirit of Christ*, he can be none of his. But he does not believe all *Men* to have this *Spirit*. His Words are; *Si autem defuerit animæ Spiritus, Animalis est verè, qui est talis, & carnalis derelictus imperfectus erit; imaginem quidem habens in plasmata, similitudinem verò non assumens per Spiritum, v. 6.* Nor did he believe that, without this *Spirit*, they could have *Spiritual Bodies*, which might

might entitle them to *Immortality*, and the *Resurrection*. So afterwards ; *Per Spiritum surgentia fiunt corpora Spiritualia, uti per Spiritum semper permanentem habeant vitam*, v. 7. Again ; *Sic ergo pignus hoc habitans in nobis jam Spirituales efficit, & absorbetur mortale ab immortalitate*, c. 8, 9. It is endless to transcribe all his Places to this Purpose. His xii. Chap. is very considerable. He there makes a *Distinction* between the *πνοὴ ζωῆς* and the *πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν* in the Greek of *Genesis*. The *πνοὴ ζωῆς*, he says, makes a Man only *ψυχικόν*. For this *Flatus vitæ*, is with him the *animæ* or *ψυχῇ*. This is all that he now has given to all Mankind. So he observes from *Is. xlii. 5.* ἥ μὲν πνοὴν παντὶ κοινῶς τῷ ὄντι γῆς λαῶν φήσας δεδόται· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἰδίως καὶ ἀπατῶσι τὰς γεώδεις ὀρθουρίας. This seems plainly to allude to the *Renunciation* of the *Lusts* of the *Flesh*, made in our *Christian Baptism*. Plainly therefore he does not allow all Mankind that Principle which can alone, in his Opinion, entitle them to the *Immortality* of their *Bodies*, and the *Resurrection*. Yet its being given as a *vital Principle* of the *new Life*, in our *Baptismal Regeneration* to that *new Life*, for our *Qualification* for *Immortal Rewards*, is very reconcilable with its *qualifying* those for *Punishments*, who have it in their *Power* to *qualifie themselves* for *eternal Rewards*,
 it

if themselves pleased. God's Pleasure, is here alleged as the Reason why those Beings may be perpetuated, which, of their own Nature, can lay no claim to a Perpetuity of Duration. And it is again perfectly depending on his Pleasure, which way he will perpetuate them to Punishment; who, through their own Fault, have never received the Baptismal Immortalizing Spirit. We may assign them a Spirit that may only immortalize them. Or he may himself, if he pleases, perpetuate their Duration, without any subordinate Influence of any Spirit at all.

6.
And Athenagoras.

So also Athenagoras in his excellent Discourse concerning the Resurrection: 'Ο ὁ καὶ νῦν καὶ λόγον δεξάμενος, ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος. καὶ ψυχὴ καὶ αὐτῷ. Ἄνθρωπος ἅρα δὲ καὶ ἐκ ἀμφοτέρων ὅντα διαμένει εἰς αἰῶνα. Here are all the three Parts already mentioned as requisite to the Perfect Man that may διαμένει εἰς αἰῶνα. Only the Supreme and Noblest part of all, which the Scripture calls πνεῦμα, is here expressed in terms more received among the Heathen Philosophers to whom the Author writes, of Νῦς and Λόγος. Both of them may be applied to the same thing in different respects, only Νῦς is the nobler Appellation of the Two. The Humane Spirit is Λόγος with relation to the Divine Spirit, that is, the Third Person in the Trinity. Yet it is Νῦς if compared with the Hu-

Humane Soul. And it is plainly *contradistinguished* from the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta'\ \iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\omega$, as that which cannot make a *Man* with the *Soul* alone, without the *Body*. This seems to allude to its title of the *Second Adam*, the *Man* from *Heaven*, which may denominate a $\text{C}\omega\mu\alpha\ \pi\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ that may be entitled to *Immortality* and the *Resurrection*. It therefore supposes a $\text{C}\omega\mu\alpha\ \psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$, because it is not another *Body*, but the *same* *changed* (that is the *Apostles* word) and, by the *change* ennobled and exalted to a more excellent State, from that of being *Corruptible* to *Incorruption*, and of being *Mortal* to *Immortality*. This must have been this admirable Author's design, in order to prove the *Resurrection* of the *Body*. None, that I know, ever pretended that *Soul*, which is *common* to all *Mankind*, to be alone sufficient for *immortalizing* the *Body*. But it was the *received* Opinion among *Christians*, that the $\pi\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha$ or $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, as derived from *Christ* the *fontal* $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, added not to the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ alone, but to the $\text{C}\omega\mu\alpha\ \psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$, was sufficient for it, to *change* our *vile Bodies*, and to make them like his *glorious Body*, from whom, all *Men* (who could pretend a good Title) were, (by the *Apostle's Reasoning*) to *derive* their Title to the *Resurrection*. At least this $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is to give us a Title to have our *Bodies* raised by *Christ*, as this makes us *one Spirit* with him, and

and consequently gives him a Title to our Bodies as animated by his Spirit. He likewise proceeds on the same Principles in his Legation. He there gives an account of the fall of the Angels by Women, So the Greek Interpreters call the Sons of Seth, Gen. vi. He tells us therefore that these Angels fell from Heaven, *περὶ τὰ ἀέρα ἔχοντες καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐκείνην εἰς τὰ ὑπερθεάνια ὑπερκύψαι δυνάμενοι.* This is agreeable to what I have observed in my Discourse of Marriages according to the Notions of those Times. They being of a Pneumatical Original have therefore the next place to Heaven allowed them, when their forfeiture of Spirit, and the *ὑπερορρήσις* following upon it (to speak in the Language of the Platonists) had disabled them for mounting thither again. But the Souls of the Giants, born of the Daughters of Men, he says, are *οἱ περὶ κόσμον πλανώμενοι δαίμονες*, the *ἀσέρες πλανῆται* the Authors of *πλάνη*, that go too and fro in the Earth, in the style of the Scriptures, *πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν*, in that of Hesiod. These are on the Earth, and yet lower than the fallen Angels, as being of a mixt Nature: Spiritual, as being by their Fathers descended from both, and yet Psysical only as descended from the Daughters of Cain, who never had any pretensions to the Spirit.

13.
And Theophilus Antiochenus.

Theophilus Antiochenus reckons Man as neither Mortal nor Immortal of his own Nature,

ture, but capable of either state according to his own behaviour. His words are, Μέγας γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐλεγόνη, ὅτε θνητὸς ὀλοχερῶς ὅτε ἀθάνατος τὸ καθόλου, δεκτικός ᾗ ἐκατέ-
 μων, L. ii. ad Autolyc. p. 101. Again, Ἀλλὰ ῥησὶ ἐν τῇς ἡμῶν, θνητὸς φύσει ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, Οὐδαμῶς. Τί ἐν, ἀθάνατος; Οὐδὲ τῷτο φα-
 νερὸν· ἀλλὰ ἔρεϊ τις, εἶδεν ἐν ἐγένετο, εἶδ' ἐ τῷτο; ἐγὼ μὲν. [Perhaps ἐγῶμαι for ἐγὼ οἶμαι in the stile of *Dialogues*] Οὐτε ἐν φύσει θνητὸς ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἀθάνατος. Εἰ γὰρ ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπεποιήκει, θεὸν ἂν ἐπεποιήκει· πάλιν εἰ θνητὸν αὐτὸν πεποιήκει, εἰδόκει ἂν ὁ θεὸς αἰτιᾶν (εἶ) τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. Οὐτε ἐν ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν, ὅτε μὴν θνητὸν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς περὶ ῥήκαμην, δεκτικὸν ἀμφοτέρων· ὥστε ῥέψῃ ὅπῃ σατὰ ἀθανάσιας, τηρήσας τὴν ἐντο-
 λὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, μισθὸν κομίσῃται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀθανάσιαν, καὶ γένῃται θεός· εἰ δ' αὖ τραπῇ ὅπῃ τὰ τοῦ θανάτου πρᾶγμα, παρακίεσας τοῦ θεοῦ, αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ αἰτιᾶν ἢ τῷ θανάτῳ.
 I have mended the Pointings for clearing the Sense. God's not being the Author of Death is from *Wisd.* i. 12, 13. as appears from the word ἐπεσπασατο used by him a little after, which is the very word of that *Apocryphal* Author. Our Promotion to a Divine Nature is likewise probably derived from *Gen.* iii. 22. But it is warranted by the *New Testament*, and by other *Authorities* of the best and purest Ages, as I have long since shewn in my *Prolegom.* to my

my Tutor's Book *de Obſtinatione*. Accordingly his *Hypotheſis* is, That even *Corporal Death* was *not* deſigned for *Mankind* by God, any more than *Corporal Immortality*. That *Corporal Death* was *not* deſigned, he takes for granted from that place of *Wiſdom*. That *Corporal Immortality* was *not* deſigned, he proves, becauſe God did *not* at firſt make *Man* a God. Meaning that *lower* notion of God which was *conſiſtent* with his being made a God, ſuppoſing however that even this *lower* Notion of being a God would have been ſufficient to have ſecured him from *actual Mortality* from which the *Nature* of that *Human Soul*, without the *adſcitiſious Divinity* would *not* ſecure him. Otherwiſe God's making him no more than a *Man* would have *determin'd* him to be *Immortal*, contrary to the certain ſenſe of this very *antient* Author. This *Reasoning* therefore plainly ſuppoſes the *Human Soul* alone *not* ſufficient for *Immortality* without the *acceſſion* of this nobler *Divine Principle*; and that in *conjunction* with it, all *three* together are ſufficient, ſo that if God had made them all ingredient in the *Nature* of *Mankind*, he muſt have made it neceſſarily *Immortal*. And both theſe particulars are not only neceſſary *Conſequences* from his *Reasoning*, but perfectly agreeable to his *Opinion*. He had before obſerved the *Sacred Writers* words concerning the *Formation* of *Man*, that God
breathed

breathed into him πνοὴν ζωῆς καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἀν-
 θρώπῳ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. Ὅθεν (says he)
 καὶ ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ὠνόμασαι παρὰ τοῖς
 πλείοσι. Implying plainly that he was
 not himself of the number of the many who
 thought so. That appears from what I have
 now said for him, and what I have said
 concerning the distinction of this πνοὴ &
 ζωῆς from the πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖν, which was
 taken for the true Principle of Immortality,
 from S. Irenæus. I cannot therefore easily
 believe that they were Christians who were
 meant by the πλείους here mention'd. But
 who then (may you say) could they be
 that proved the Immortality of the Soul from
 Scripture? Perhaps the Jewish Pharisees,
 who were the most Popular Sect among the
 Jews, and who defended the Being, not on-
 ly of Angels, but of πνεύματα distinct from
 Angels, Act. xxiii. 8. Yet not so Critical as
 to distinguish between the πνοὴ and the
 πνεῦμα, as S. Irenæus was, when they rea-
 soned from the πνεῦμα to the πνοή. Yet
 they might, at this time, have been Hea-
 then Philosophers, who, from the time of
 Numenius and Cronius, and so downwards,
 admitted of the Jewish Hypothesis as con-
 siderable in the Elective Sect of Philosophy
 then prevailing, which did not confine it
 self to any one received Sect, nor even to
 the general consent of their Heathen Masters.
 And considering the Adversaries with whom
 our

our Author deals in this *Work*, this may indeed be the more *likely* Opinion. But, for the way how *Man* was to attain the *Divine Principle* that was to make him a *God*, and, in consequence thereof, give him a title to *Immortality*, and the *Resurrection* of his *Body* also; he thus describes it. Μετέθηκεν ὁ αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐξ ἧς ἐγενόνη, εἰς τὴν παραδείσον, διδύς αὐτῷ ἀφορμὴν περικοπῆς, ὅπως, αὐξάνων, καὶ τέλει γενόμενος, ἐτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς, ἔτι καὶ εἰς τὸ ὑπεράνω ἀναβῇ. Here it is plain, that (by his Principles) the title to *Immortality*, and to *ascend* into *Heaven*, could not otherwise be expected but by his αὐξήσις, his *Improvement* beyond what he had received at his first *Creation*, which yet was *all* that his *Posterity* could claim from him, as bearing his εἰκὼν, and descending from him. And what that *Improvement* was, we may easily understand by the word he uses concerning it, of being τέλειος. That may indeed imply maturity of *Age* in him who represents *Adam* as a *Child* at his first *Creation*. But they did not own any *Proficiency* in *Gods*, even in their *Gods* who were owned to have a *beginning*. *Cupid* and *Mercury*, in the *Heathen* Mythologies, are made to perform the Office of *Adults* as soon as ever they were *born*. The perfect *Man* therefore here is the same that is called so by *S. Paul* and *S. Irenæus* and the other *Fathers*

thers of this Age, who is made so by the addition of the Spirit to the other constituents of Man at his first Creation, common to all who partake of the same Humane Nature. This was taken for the ultimate complement of the perfect Man, as that which made him perfect, as the Divine Nature which made him (in the style of Theophilus) a God, and therefore entitled him to Immortality; and the Heavenly οὐκλήριον. To this purpose he has another subtle Mystical Observation on the passage of Genesis: Ἐν τῇ Γενέσει γέγραπται· ὡς δὲ αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ Παραδείσῳ τεθέντος· ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἀπαξ ἢ πεπληρωμένον ποτὲ ἐτέθην· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλει πληρῶσθαι μετὰ τῷ ἀνάσσειν καὶ κείσθαι. Paradise, with the Mystical Interpreters, (and according to the design of God himself, as he was pleased to signify his mind by Mystical Symbols) was taken for a Symbol of Heaven. Accordingly the placing the Man in Paradise signified the conferring on him a Title to Heaven. These Mystical Expositors therefore make the Man, who was made of the dust of the Earth, not to have been made in Paradise, but in that Earth out of the dust of which he was made. And that purposely, with this design, that God might thereby signify, that Man had no title to Immortality and Heaven, barely on account of the Humane Nature he had received at his first Creation,

E

and

and which was to be *transmitted* by him to his *Posterity*. Yet afterwards God was pleased to *confer* that further Honour upon him of the *Man from Heaven*, and *κατ' εἰκόνα*, which gave him a present title to *Paradise*; and thereby a Title in *reversion* to *Heaven*, which was typified by *Paradise* as a *Covenanting Symbol*. This therefore entitled him to that *first Translation* into *Paradise*, which *Theophilus* observes as then performed by God immediately, in the *History of Genesis*. To this he was entitled on account of the *Spiritualizing* of his *Soul* by the union of the *Spirit* with it. The *remaining Translation*, mentioned by *Theophilus*, as expected after the *Resurrection* and the *Judgment*, is plainly that of the *Body*, when that also was to be *cloathed* with the *Spiritual Body*. Till then the *Body* could have no claim to *Immortality* or *Heaven*, or *Paradise* as a *Type* of *Heaven*. But this could not be expected till the *coming* of *Christ*, whose *Office* it is, to *change* our *vile Bodies*, and to *fashion* them like his *Glorious Body*. By this whole *Reasoning* it appears, that neither *Soul* nor *Body* was then thought to have any *Right* to *Immortality* but by the *Spirit*. And that, upon account of those *Mystical Reasonings*, which were most generally received in the *Age* of the *Apostles*, and in the *Writings* of the *New Testament*.

Tertul-

Tertullian is the most antient of the *Latin* Fathers now extant. I mean, of them who wrote in *Latin*. He therefore is the best *Witness* we can expect of the Sense of the *Occidental Church*, in that early Age I am now concerned in. And he is of the same Opinion with his now mentioned *approved Predecessors*. He does indeed own the *actual Immortality* of the *Soul*, as we have seen the rest did, excepting *Tatian*. Especially of all who were, on that account, obliged to come over as *Profelytes* upon the *Publication* of the *Gospel*. And he had confuted the Opinion of *Hermogenes*, in a Book now lost, who took the *Soul* to be *è suggesta materiæ*, de An. c. i. This the *Cartesians* may perhaps take for an Argument of its *natural Immortality*, who think its *Distinction* from *Matter*, a sufficient *Proof* of its *Independence* on *Matter*, and consequently of its *natural Immortality*. But they can never prove that nothing but *Modifications* of *Matter* can depend on *Matter*, as to their *Being* and *Preservation*. The *Reasoning* is far from being *Self-evident*. Nor was it ever (that I know of) granted by any before *Descartes*. However, *Tertullian* had such Opinions concerning the *Soul*, as are inconsistent with its *Independence* upon *purèr Matter*, tho' it might survive the grosser *Organical Body* of our *Visible Humanity*. He plainly owns

14.
Tertullian
thought the
Soul ex
traduce,
and there-
fore natu-
rally Mor-
tal.

our Souls now to be *ex traduce*, as much begotten by the Souls, as our Bodies are by the Bodies of our immediate Parents. He tells us that God made Adam's Soul *matricem omnium*, and that all the variety of Humours that are in his Posterity, would also have been in him, *ut in sortæ naturæ—si varietas naturæ fuisset*, de An. c. 20. He makes it *Ingredient* in the Description of all our Souls, that they do *ex unâ redundare*, c. 21. He gives it as his own Opinion, *in utero concipi animam, cum carnis figulatione compingi atque produci*, c. 25. He makes the Soul to be introduced *de semine*, and *ex animæ semine*, ib. He makes *duas species seminis, corporalem & animalem, indiscretas tamen—& hoc modo contemporales, ejusdemque momenti*. Again: *In illo ipso voluptatis ultimæ æstu quo genitale virus expellitur, nonne aliquid de animâ quoque sentimus exire, atque adeo marcescimus & devigescimus cum lucis detrimento? Hoc aut semen animale proditur ex animæ destillatione, sicut & virus illud corporale semen ex carnis desæcatione, Fidelissima primordii exempla de limo caro in Adam. Quid aliud limus quàm liquor optimus? Inde erit genitale virus, ex adflatu Dei anima. Quid aliud adflatus Dei, quàm vapor Spiritus? Inde erit quod per virus illud efflamus, quum igitur in primordio duo diversa atque divisa, limus & flatus, unum hominem coegissent, confusæ substantiæ ambæ*

ambæ jam in uno semina quoque sua miscuerunt, atque exinde generi propagando formam traderunt, ut & nunc duo licet diversa, etiam unita pariter effluant, pariterque insinuata sulco & arvo suo, pariter hominem ex utraque substantiâ effruticent, in quo rursus semen suum insit secundum genus, sicut omni conditioni genitali præstitutum est. Igitur ex uno homine tota hæc animarum redundantia agitur, observante scilicet naturâ Dei edictum: Crescite, & in multitudinem proficite. Nam & in ipsâ præfatione operis unius: Faciamus hominem, universa posteritas pluraliter prædicata est, & præfint piscibus maris. Nihil mirum, repromissio segetis in semine, c. 27. Again: Constitueramus animam in ipso, & ex ipso feri hominem, & unum esse à primordiis semen, sicut & carnis, in totum generis examen, &c. c. 36. He adds, that the anima is in utero seminata pariter cum carne. He owns the Difference of Sex in the Souls, as well as the in Bodies. He owns the Soul to have a Body, and plainly in another Sense from that wherein he ascribes Corporeity to God himself. He owns the same Progress in the Powers of the Soul, as in the Body, though not in its Substance, for fear of actual Mortality, c. 37. Such a Soul as this is (though it might survive the gross Organical Body; yet) even Cartesians themselves could not believe it independent on Matter in its own Nature. If therefore it

be preserved from actual Mortality, it must be by the like Interposition of an extraordinary Providence, as that by which our Bodies themselves are to be immortalized after the Resurrection. I know how severely this Doctrine is censur'd, by those who have more regard to the Consent of the present Churches, than the Original Traditions of the Primitive Church, with as unanimous Consent then, as can be pretended now. But it was then thought very reasonable with all that was then taken for Apostolical Tradition.

15.
That Opinion of Tertullian, though generally deserted in the end of the 4th Century (when the Opinion that favoured the natural Immortality of the Soul begun) yet was not, even then, condemned.

About the fourth Century, the present Doctrine concerning the Creation of Souls seems to have begun; and in the first Creation, is understood by the Modern Schoolmen. From that time the Western Churches especially, have been pleased with that turn of S. Augustin, that *creando infunditur, & infundendo creatur*. Yet even S. Augustin himself, who takes notice of this Doctrine of Tertullian, and that in his Book *de Heresibus*, dares not however condemn it for a Heresie. He confines the Heresie of Tertullian to his siding with the Montanists. No doubt, very well remembering, that in the Reconciliation of the few remaining Tertullianists with the Church (which he mentions as performed within his own Memory) no other Recantation was exacted or expected from them, but only that of

the

Apolog. ad
Anastaf.

the Communion, and the Characteristical Doctrines of the Montanists. So also Rufinus, he mentions several late Disputes concerning the beginning of the Soul, and several Opinions then received concerning it. Among them this: *Quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam anima diffundatur.* He adds: *Quod puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse, vel Lactantium, fortassis & alios nonnullos.* But his own Opinion he durst not determine; *Usque ad præsens certi vel definiti aliquid de hac Quæstione non teneo, sed Deo relinquo scire quid sit in vero, & si cui ipsi revelare dignabitur.* And he gives this Reason of his Reservedness: *Adhuc ignorare confiteor præter hoc quod manifestè tradit Ecclesia: Deum esse & animarum & corporum conditorem.* This is all that was designed by the Church then. The Church had neither declared against this Doctrine of Tertullian, which supposed the Souls natural Mortality, nor declared for the contrary Doctrine of its natural Immortality, and its immediate Creation, which has since prevailed. For even this was one of the Opinions mention'd by him before, wherein he durst not be positive for this very Reason, because the Church had not as yet declared her Sense in favour of it. So in this Case he pleads for himself, when he was accused by S. Hierome of Heresie, for transla-

S. Hierom
ad Ruffin.
L. II. L.
III.

Ep. 82. Ed.
Mar. Vi-
ctor.

ting Origen's Books, *weeì 'Apχωv*. And that in a Defence to Pope *Anastāsius*, the first Bishop of the Occidental Church, upon that Accusation. Nor dares S. *Hierome*, even in the height of his *Resentment*, condemn *Ruffinus* for not condemning this Opinion in *Tertullian*, though himself was against it, and was unwilling to excuse *Ruffinus* for being so indifferent in the Matter. Yet even he is more favourable, when his Concern against *Ruffinus* was in some measure allay'd by the Death of his Adversary. Then he owns it, as not only the Sense of *Tertullian*, but of *Apollinaris*, and of the greatest part of the Occidental Writers, *Ut quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascatur ex anima, & simili cum brutis animantibus conditione subsistat*. So he in his Epistle to *Marcellinus* and *Anapsychia*. This is the most invidious Consequence that can be inferred from this Doctrine of the natural Mortality of the Soul of Man, that it would be herein equal with the Souls of Beasts. Yet even this so warm a Man as S. *Hierome* durst not censure, even in an Age so distant from the Age of the Apostles, as that was wherein he wrote this, so long as the Humane Soul was, notwithstanding acknowledged secure from actual Mortality. Yet there are indeed very antient Authors, who compare lapsed Men with the Beasts that perish. And perhaps not without the

Autho-

Authority of that known Passage of the Psalmist, *Pf. xlviii. 13. 21.* S. Augustin also is almost as deficient of the true Original of the Soul, in Relation to the Opinion of Tertullian, in his Ep. to Optatus, as Rufinus himself. And he takes notice of S. Hierome's ascribing that same Opinion to the Occidental Church, without contradicting it. The thing that inclined the Occidentals to it then, was, that they thought it most reconcilable with the then newly designed Doctrine of Original Sin. So Pelagius had objected, as S. Augustin there observes: *Si anima ex traduce non est, sed sola caro tantum habet traducem peccati; sola ergo pœnam meretur.* Here then lay the Difficulty of both sides. On the one side, they could not easily account how a new created Spirit could contract a Contagion of Sin from Adam, without any Traduction of its Being from him. On the other side, they thought it likewise difficult to defend the Immortality of our Souls, if they were derived by Traduction, not from God immediately, but from the Souls of our immediate Forefathers. This made the zealous Defenders of Original Sin, weary of censuring this Doctrine of Tertullian, lest they should thereby drive them off from their Communion, who thought the Doctrine of Original Sin no way defensible without it. However they would never have run into one Herefie,

Heretic, for avoiding another. It is therefore plain, that they did not then, in the beginning of the fifth Century, when these *Pelagian* Disputes were started, believe this Doctrine of the Soul's natural Mortality Heretical, so long as there was no Question made of its being actually Immortal. The Author of the Dialogue, under the Names of S. Hierome and S. Augustin, collected out of their own Works, gives us the Names of several others, who joined in this same Opinion with Tertullian. They are, Apollonius, Pompeius, Arnobius, Lactantius and Apollinaris. Of these, Apollonius was a little elder than Tertullian, and had confuted the Montanists, whom Tertullian defended against him. Thence it appears, that this Doctrine of *Traduction* was not even then proper to the Sect of Montanus, nor condemned in him by the Catholic Church. Apollonius therefore is another Witness of this Doctrine in that Age.

16. As for Tertullian, as he is full, so he is not (that I can perceive) singular, if we consider his Age. He derives the *Humane Soul* from the *Flatus Vitæ* in *Genesis*, as S. Irenæus and others, both his Predecessors and Successors did also, de Anim. c. 3. He distinguishes this *Flatus* or *πνεῦμα*, from *Spiritus* or *πνεῦμα*, as expressly as the same S. Irenæus, and from the same Passage of *Is. xlii. 5.* from whence it is proved by S.

Tertullian is also otherwise very full in asserting the natural Mortality of the Soul, and in deriving its actual Immortality from the Spirit.

S. Irenæus and Theophilus. So Tertullian,
 c. 11. He does as plainly make this Spirit
 adscititious, not common to all Mankind, as
 the Flatus was. *Neque Dei, neque Diaboli*
Spiritus ex nativitate conferatur animæ, ib.
 Though he makes the Soul the same with
 the Spirit in another Notion of the same
 Word, as it signifies that by which we
 breathe, c. 10. He gives the Soul a Body,
 and a Shape, as well as St. Irenæus. Nor
 does he doubt, any more than he, but that
 the Spirit is the only solid Ground for the
 Claim of Immortality. As for proper Im-
 mortality, he allows it only to that which is
 Innatum and Infectum, that is, *αἰτενῆλον* and
ἀσυνῆλον, in the Language of the Greek
 Philosophers, and therefore confines it to
 God alone, c. 21. And therefore he can
 allow no other Immortality, but of Grace to
 any created Beings. For this is the known
 Language and Principles, and Reasoning of
 Plato in his *Timæus*, and the generality of
 those who use these Terms, and must be
 understood accordingly. What therefore
 was made, and had a Beginning, if it have
 not an End; it cannot, in this way of Rea-
 soning, be imputable to its own Nature, but
 to the Arbitrary Pleasure of God. In this
 therefore Tertullian professes himself of an-
 other Mind from Plato, who thought the
 Soul Innatam. On which Concession, Ter-
 tullian reasons thus: *Adjicit immortalem,*
incor-

incorruptibilem, incorporalem (quia hoc & Deum credidit) invifibilem, ineffigiabilem, uniformem, principalem, rationalem, intellectualem. Quid amplius proſcriberet Animam, ſi eam Deum nuncuparet? Nos autem qui nihil Deo appendimus, hoc ipſo animam longe infra Deum expendimus, quòd natam eam agnoſcimus, ac per hoc dilutioris Divinitatis, exilioris fœlicitatis, ut flatum, non ut Spiritum. Et, ſi immortalem, ut hoc ſit Divinitatis, tamen paſſibilem, ut hoc ſit natiuitatis: ideoque & à primordio exorbitationis capacem, & inde etiam oblivionis affinem, c. 24. *Immortality*, in all this Reasoning, is taken for an Attribute proper to God. And therefore the *Immortality* that agrees to a more dilute Divinity, to a Being far inferior to God (ſuch he makes that which he aſcribes to the *Humane Soul*) muſt be a more dilute *Immortality*, and far inferior to that which properly agrees to God. What can that be but a precarious *Immortality*, and perfectly depending on the *Divine Favour*? Plainly he owns it far inferior to what it might have been expected, if the *Soul*, that is inveſted with it, had been the ſame with the *Divine Spirit*. Yet he aſcribes all the *Right* the *Body* hath to the *Reſurrection*, to the *Spiritual Rody*, with which the *Animal Body* is then to be inveſted, which alſo is called *Spiritual* from the *Spirit*, then to be received by it, de Reſ. Carn. c. 53.

Origen's private *Opinions* are rather favourable to that side of the Question, that magnifies the Nature of the *Humane Soul* beyond the Bounds of *Truth* and *Catholick Tradition*. That Consideration would, to be sure, have made him inclinable to take the uttermost Advantage true *Tradition* could have afforded him, against the *natural Mortality* of the *Soul*, and in favour of that *Divine Nature* of the *Flatus*, which with the *Spirit*, is its only security against *actual Mortality*. This is sufficient to secure his Testimonies of this kind from any Suspicion of the *Errors* and *Paradoxes*, with which his Doctrine has been charged, in the Disputes and Judicial Sentences given against him. In this Case his *Concernment* for the *contrary*, makes his Authority more worthy of Regard, than it would have been if he had been *less concerned*. Yet even *he* could find no Pretence of *Apostolical Tradition*, or Consent of the *Catholick Church* in his time, against the now mentioned Opinion of *Tertullian*, concerning the *Souls* being *ex traduce*, which supposes, though not its *actual*, yet its *natural Mortality*. His Words are very plain to this Purpose, in his Preface to his famous Work *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. *De animâ verò utrum ex semine traducis ducatur, ita ut ratio ipsius vel substantia inserta ipsis seminibus corporalibus habeatur, an verò aliud habeat initium:*

17.
Origen knew no Tradition of the Church in his Age, against that Opinion of Tertullian, though himself differed greatly from it. No, nor Pamphilus nor Eusebius

& hoc ipsum initium, si genitum est, an non
 genitum: vel certè si intrinsecus corpori indi-
 tur, necne: non satis manifestà prædicatione
 distinguitur. The *Prædicatio* here men-
 tioned, is the same with that which he
 had before called the *Ecclesiastica prædicatio*
per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita,
 & usque ad præsens in *Ecclesiâ præmanens.*
 That he makes the *Rule* within which he
 designed to confine his future *Disputes* de-
 signed in this *Work*, very piously and pru-
 dently. He was wary of giving wanton
Wits a *Precedent* for calling any thing in
Question, that might any way affect those
Doctrines wherein the *Catholick Church* of
that Age was agreed, as derived from the
Apostles. This therefore shews that he
 was very secure that *Catholick Tradition* had
 determined nothing contrary to this *Do-*
ctrine, which would, in the *Consequence*,
 make the *Soul naturally Mortal.* Pamphi-
 lus in his *Apology* for *Origen*, has more *Te-*
stimonies of the same kind out of other *Pas-*
sages of his *Works*, by which we know that
 this *Acknowledgment* was the *Result* of
Origen's most deliberate and sedate
Thoughts. Pamphilus also, in repeating
 these *Affertions* of *Origen* with *Approba-*
tion, shews, that even his own *Age* was as
 ignorant of any *Apostolical Tradition* incon-
 sistent with this *Doctrine*, as that of *Origen.*
 Yet he is aware of the *Consequence*, that, if
 the

the Soul should be *ex traduce*, it must be Mortal. So he reasons: *Sed & illud quod sequitur, quod perabsurdum est incurrere, non praevident, quia necesse est eam simul cum corpore mori, & esse mortalem si simul cum corpore vel seminata, vel formata, vel nata, est.* It is actual Mortality that he proves would be the Consequence, as appears by the Argument he afterwards insists on. This therefore is that he takes here for an Absurdity, and afterwards for contradictory to the true Faith. So Pamphilus also will be another Witness for us. S. Hierome makes Eusebius the Author of that Apology ascribed to Pamphilus by Rufinus. And he does so with a Design of overthrowing the Credit of Rufinus. But I see no Reason why it may not have been written by both of them. And, if so, we shall then have two Testimonies more confirming that of Origen, and carrying it lower than he did, that, even in the beginning of the fourth Century, there was yet no consentient Tradition of the Catholick Church against this Opinion.

S. Cyprian's Thoughts concerning our first and second Nativity, may be learn'd from these Words of his Epistle to Pompeianus: *Porro autem non per manus impositionem quis nascitur quando accipit Spiritum sanctum, sed in Baptismo; ut Spiritum jam natus accipiat, sicut in primo homine Adam factum est. Ante enim Deus eum plasmavit, & tunc in-*

18.
S. Cyprian owns the same Distinction between our first Birth, by which we receive our Souls; and the second by which we receive the Spirit. sufflavit

sufflavit in faciem ejus flatum vitæ. Nec enim potest accipi Spiritus, nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat. To which may be added, those other Words of his in his Epistle to *Fidus*, concerning the Baptism of Infants: *Prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primæ nativitate contraxit. Qui ad remissionem peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata.* The first Nativity of Adam is his *Plasmation*, as he calls it, out of the dust of the Earth. This was that which was capable of receiving the first Life from the *Flatus Vitæ*. That *Flatus Vitæ* in S. Cyprian's Master, *Tertullian*, is the *πρὸν ζῶν* by which he became a *ψυχὴ ζῶσα*, as the Apostle himself observes from the Passage of *Genesis*. This we receive from Adam, and by receiving this alone, we are reckon'd as carnaliter nati secundum Adam, as descending from the *Flesh* of Adam, and in Opposition to the *Spiritual Nativity* in Baptism, as *Flesh* and *Spirit* are opposed in the Reasonings of the Sacred Writers. By this we are said, *contagium mortis antiquæ contrahere*. Exactly answering the Reasoning of the Apostle, that reckons us in Adam, whilst we have no more than this living Soul which we receive from Adam; and reckons withal this State of Being in Adam.

as a State of *Mortality*, because this *living Soul*, which we have as descending from him, is not *alone* sufficient to secure us from that *actual Mortality*, to which he was condemned immediately upon his fall. This is that *mors antiqua*, in allusion to the *old Man*, and the *first Adam*, mentioned by *S. Paul*, and in *Opposition* to the *Second Death* in the *Revelations*, from the *new* and *diviner Life*. The *second Birth* therefore he makes in *Baptism*, and the *second Life* is by him ascribed to the *Spirit* given after *Baptism*, by the *Imposition* of the hands of the *Bishop*. This therefore, as *stopping* that *Contagion* of the *old Death*, must needs be taken for a *Principle* of *Immortality*. And it is plainly a *præternatural Principle*, as being *distinct* from that by which *Adam* became a *living Soul*. However, as it is a *Principle* of a *new* and *immortal Life*, *S. Cyprian* uses the Word *animari*, concerning the *Holy Ghost* himself. So: *In novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris animatus*. And again: *Terrenum fuisse, quod prius carnaliter natum delictis obnoxium viveret; Dei esse cœpisse, quod jam Spiritus Sanctus animaret*. He speaks this of his new *Baptismal State*; *Postquam cœlitus Spiritu hausto, in novum me hominem Nativitas secunda reparavit*. This is the *Man* from *Heaven*; in the *Language* of the *Apostle*, and *Plato*. By this therefore the *Apostle*

intimates, That, though this *adventitious Nature* did not belong to the Constitution of *Human Nature* at its first Creation, yet it did to the Constitution of *that Man*, which the *Christians* of *that* and the former Age called the *perfect* and *Spiritual Man*.

19.
 Arnobius
 owns our
 Souls
 Mortal
 in their
 own Na-
 ture, and
 Immortal
 only by the
 Spirit.

Arnobius has his Paradoxes on this Subject, for which himself *alone* is responsible. And his Case is the more excusable, considering that he was but a *Catechumen* when he wrote his *Book*, and was not thoroughly instructed in the *Christian Doctrine*. But he is more to be regarded when he speaks conformably to the sense of *other* Catholick Doctors of that *early Age*. So he does when he confutes *Plato* for making the *Humane Souls* the *Offspring* of *God*, and *Immortal* in such a sense, as those Beings, which were so, were reputed, on that very account, of their being of a *Divine Original*. This *Tertullian* had done before him, as I have already observed. This he does frequently, through a great part of his second Book. Neither he therefore, nor the others, who *reasoned* as he did, could not understand the passage of *Aratus* approved by *S. Paul*, of all *Souls* in general, but only of the capacity all *those* were in of being *immortaliz'd* who heard the *Gospel*. Yet even the *Immortality* of such Beings he proves not *Natural* but perfectly depending on the *Divine Pleasure* from the ex-
 press

press words of *Plato* in his *Timæus*. He makes therefore their *Longævity* (that is his word) *summi principis munus ac beneficium*, p. 65. He blames the *Platonists* for expecting the *πλίσσωσις* at their deaths. On the contrary he delivers his own Opinion thus: *Nos nobis nihil de nostrâ infirmitate promittimus, Naturam intuentes nostram virium esse nullarum*, p. 66. Again, *Nos tantam reformidamus audaciam, nec in nostrâ ducimus esse positum potestate, sedes superas petere: cum & hoc ipsum habeamus incertum, an vitam accipere mereamur, & ab lege mortalitatis abduci*, ib. *Sed immortales perhibentur Dii esse. Non ergo Natura, sed voluntate Dei patris ac munere. Quo igitur pacto immortalitas largitoris est Donum DEI circa prolatos*, [This is from the Language of those Philosophers by whose example the *Gnosticks* called their *Æons* *ὑποβολαί*] & *animas hoc pacto dignabitur immortalitate donare, quamvis eas mors sæva posse videatur extinguere, & ad nihilum redactas irremediabili abolitione delere*, p. 68. Then he proves his Doctrine concerning their Gods from *Plato's Timæus*, ib. & p. 87. He again makes it the *Prerogative* of God alone to make Souls Immortal: *cui soli potestas est talia corruptione exclusa largiri*, p. 79. And he very frequently owns it for his own Opinion, That the Souls of Men are of a middle Nature between Mortality and Im-

mortality, and capable of either, as God is pleased to allot it to them, herein agreeing with *Theophilus Antiochenus*. So p. 52. *Sunt enim mediæ qualitatis sicut Christo auctore compertum est, & interire quæ possint, Deum si ignoraverint; vitæ & ab exitio liberari, si ad ejus seminas atq; indulgentias applicarint.* So again, p. 65, 67, 79. And he grants this, not only of *Humane Souls*, but of all other Beings whatsoever, excepting only the Supreme: *Omnes omnino, quos esse opinatio suspicatur, Dii, Angeli, Dæmones, aut nomine quocunq; sunt alio, qualitatis & ipsi sunt mediæ, & ambiguae sortis conditione mutabiles*, p. 67. Accordingly, he makes annihilation (though a tedious one, and therefore with a more exquisite torment) to be the Punishment of the Damned. So p. 52. *Illa quæ sub oculis cernitur, animarum est à corporibus dijugatio, non finis abolitionis extremus. Hæc, inquam, est hominis mors vera, cum animæ nescientes Deum per longissimi temporis cruciatum consumentur igni sero, in quem illas jacent quidam crudeliter sævi, & ante Christum incogniti, & ab solo sciente detecti*, p. 86. *Res vestra in ancipiti sita est, salus, dico, animarum vestrarum, & nisi vos applicatis Dei principis notioni, à corporalibus vinculis exolutos expectat mors sæva, non repentinam asserens extinctionem, sed per tractum temporis cruciabilis pænæ acerbitate consumens.* He therefore did not believe any

any *Humane Souls* actually immortalized besides those of the good. And, in *their* Case, he ascribes their *Immortality* to God's Pleasure in giving them his *Spirit*. So p. 87. *Servare animas alius, nisi Deus Omnipotens non potest: nec præterea quisquam est, qui longævas facere, perpetuitatis possit & SPIRITUM subrogare, nisi qui immortalis & perpetuus solus est, & nullius temporis circumscriptione finitus.* Even he, who makes all other Beings, besides the Supreme, naturally *Mortal*; and, if *Immortal*, yet only so precariously: does notwithstanding own this *Divine Spirit* so *Immortal* in it self, as withal to be a *Principle* of *Immortality* to those *Humane Souls* to which God is pleased to grant it. Yet he concerns *Christ* also in giving this *Spirit*. So p. 89. *Unius Pontificium Christi est, dare animis salutem, & SPIRITUM perpetuitatis apponere.* As granted to him by the Father, as *Arnobius* himself had observed before. This is the reason why the *Spirit*, though it be said to proceed from the *Father*, is notwithstanding called the *Spirit* of *Christ* by the Sacred Writers themselves. Allowing therefore for the *Paradoxes* of *Arnobius*; yet he is full, and not without *Authority* of those who understood the *Christian Religion* better than he did, in the two principal *Assertions* for which I am concerned at present: That of the *Soul's Mortality* by Na-

ture, and that its actual Immortality was owned as received from the Spirit.

20.
So also
Lactanti-
us.

Lactantius takes some liberty as well as his Master *Arnobius*. But in the main, his Opinion seems to have been the same with the eminent Persons now mentioned. He also takes *Man* to be of a middle Nature, capable of Immortality as a reward of his good behaviour; otherwise Mortal, if he did not answer expectation. God, he says, made them *inter bonum malumq; medias, ut constantibus utrisq; naturis virtutem proponeret, ne immortalitate, delicate assequerentur ac molliter, sed ad illud æternæ vitæ ineliquibile præmium summâ cum difficultate ac magnis laboribus pervenirent*, Instit. vii. 5. Again, *Nam quia homo ex duabus rebus constat, corpore atque animâ, quorum alterum terrenum est, alterum cæleste; duæ vitæ homini attributæ sunt: una temporalis, quæ corpori assignatur; altera sempiterna, quæ animæ subiacet. Illam nascendo accepimus, hanc assequimur laborando; ne immortalitas, (ut ante diximus) sine ullâ difficultate constaret*. And he expressly denies this Immortality to be the effect of Nature. So afterwards: *Virtuti enim, non Naturæ datur; quia voluit nos Deus vitam vobis in vitâ comparare*. Again: *Nam nihil interessit inter justum & injustum; si quidem omnis homo natus immortalis fieret ergo immortalitas non sequela Naturæ, sed merces præmiumq; virtutis est*. He not only denies this

this, but owns our title to *Immortality* as derived from our *Baptism*, and our *Baptismal Spirit* which we there receive. His words are very remarkable to this purpose: *Quæ ratio docet, mortalem nasci hominem; postea verò immortalem fieri, cum cœperit ex Deo vivere, id est, justitiam sequi; quæ continetur in Dei cultu; cum excitaverit hominem Deus ad aspectum cœli ac sui. Quod tum fit, cum homo cœlesti lavacro purificatus, exponit infantiam cum omni labe vitæ prioris; & incremento Divini vigoris accepto, fit homo perfectus ac plenus.* This perfect Man, in the stile of the *Apostle* and *S. Irenæus*, is he who has the *Divine Spirit* received in our *Saviour's* regenerating *Baptism*, which therefore must be the *Principle of Immortality* here mentioned. This is the *Spirit* which, *Lactantius* says, God puts into a *terrene Body*, is which he calls *sempiternum*, vii. 12. and *æternum*, ib. è cœlo & à Deo, ii. 12. vii. 4, 5. ii. 11. & Deo, 12. à Deo inspiratam, vii. 12. which he calls *animam*: *Ficlo corpore spiravit ei animam de vitale Spiritus sui, qui est perennis.* Which, he makes *Immortal*, if it be victorious: *ut si anima superaverit, quæ ex Deo oritur, sit immortalis, & in perpetuâ luce versetur.* And *L. iii. 12.* He says the same of the *Human Spirit*. But he cannot mean it to be so *naturally*, if it be so no otherwise than *conditionally*. He has withal a clear notion of *Soul*, as distinct

from the Spirit, so distinctly and independently subsistent, as that being actually separated, one will be a Principle of Mortality, the other of Immortality, to him that has them. So L. vii. c. 5. *Cum posset semper spiritibus suis immortalibus innumerabiles animas procreare, sicut Angelos genuit, quibus immortalitas sine ullo malorum periculo ac metu constat: excogitavit tamen inerrabile opus, quemadmodum infinitam multitudinem crearet animarum, quas primo fragilibus & imbecillis corporibus illigatus, constitueret inter bonum malumq; medias; ut constantibus ex utrisq; naturis virtutem proponeret; ne immortalitatem delicate assequerentur ac molli-ter; sed ad illud æternæ vitæ ineloquibile præmium summâ cum difficultate ac magnis laboribus pervenirent.* The way therefore, according to Lactantius, taken by Providence, for making Man's actual Mortality or Immortality the Reward or Punishment of his Free-will, was to joyn his Soul to his Body immediately, which being it self Frail and Mortal, could not secure the Soul from actual Mortality. This he supposes would make the Complex of the Soul and Body actually Mortal. But this Reasoning could not hold, unless he had believed the Soul Naturally Mortal as well as the Body. Otherwise the Nature of the Soul alone had been sufficient for its own preservation from actual Mortality though the Body had contributed

buted nothing to it. But he supposes that
 whole State of *Man Mortal*, and that the
 addition of the *Spirit* to both made both
Immortal. He makes the Body *immortalitatis*
expers, and makes that *Happiness* which the
Philosophers ascribed *non corpori, sed animo*,
 to have relation only *ad hanc vitam, quæ cum corpore terminatur*, L. iii. c. 12.
 So far he is from owning the *Immortality*
 of this *Soul*, in contradistinction to the *Spi-*
rit, as *natural* to it, that he seems to own
 its *actual Death*, for the *space* between the
Death of the *Body* and the *Resurrection*. He
 therefore ascribes the *Resurrection* to the
Soul as well as the *Body*. His words are
 these; *Et quia temporalem vitam temporalis*
mors sequitur; consequens est, ut resurgunt
animæ ad vitam perennem; quia finem mors
temporalis accepit, L. vii. c. 10. *Servatus*
Gallæus is here mistaken, when he takes
 this for an *Impropriety of Speech*, which is,
 in truth, a *real Consequence* from the *Prin-*
ciples of Lactantius. Yet he denied the
Traduction of the *Souls* from the *Human*
Parents, de Opific. Dei. c. 19. but makes them
 the *immediate work* of *God* himself, and ob-
 serves the passages even of *Lucretius*, to
 this purpose. In this he differs from the
 doctrine of *Tertullian*, who thought only
 the *Soul* of *Adam* produced by *God*, but
 that the other *Souls* descended from *his*, by
 the *prolifick Virtue* given by the words, *in-*
crease

The Distinction between

crease and multiply, as our Bodies are derived from his Body. Which form of Speech, though it could not be used by *Lactantius* concerning *Human Souls*; yet it is, where his Principles would allow of it, in relation to the *Human Body*. In that regard, he owns only one Man formed by God, L. vii. c. 4. Herein therefore *Lactantius* also seems to have imitated *Tatian* in owning the actual Mortality of the Soul, though only for so short a time. But, as for the wicked, he differed from the Opinion of his Master *Arnobius*. He does not allow them the benefit of a Punishment that might, at length, annihilate them, though with very tedious, as well as very exquisite Tortures. *Lactantius*, on the contrary, makes that Punishment Eternal. So L. ii. c. 12. concerning the Death of the wicked, he says, *Cujus non vis est, ut injustus animas extinguat omnino, sed ut puniat in æternum*. Yet *Lactantius* owns a Title of our Souls to Immortality, on that account, of their being a Divine Off-spring. So he calls even those of them who miscarry, *animas ad cœlestia genitas*, L. vii. c. 6. But that can only signify their being the fairest Candidates for the Divine Favours indefinitely; not any immediate claim to this particular one of Immortality. And their being *Genitæ* is alone sufficient to overthrow their Title to it, on account of their own Nature. Yet that is the word used by him

in the former Chapter for expressing the Original of *Human Souls* in general. If he had not declared against *Tradition* in the former Work now mentioned, this *Word* would have tempted one to suspect, that he had in earnest favoured that Original of the *Soul*. But take the *Word* in a less restrained Sense, it will however either prove, or be consistent with, a precarious *Immortality*, with the *Platonists*, that could be no otherwise *Immortal* that was *γεννῆλον* as that signified a *begotten*, or *γεννῆλον* as that signified a *fictional* Being. And, even by our modern Reasonings, it will at least, not imply any necessity of an *Immortality* by Nature. Even *Lactantius* himself owned that the first Man was made by God, as to both parts, that of his *Body*, as well as of his *Soul*. Yet he did not therefore make him *Immortal*. But having here declared for an *Immortality* depending on Man's own behaviour, *Lactantius* could not mean the *Heaven* and *Immortality*, to which he makes the *Soul* born, as due to it on account of its own Nature. By the *Soul* therefore which he also elsewhere calls *Spirit*, iii.12. He means the *Flatus*, or *πνοή*, which was an *inferiour created Being*. And by the *Spirit*, in the *contradistinct* Sense, that much more *Divine Being*, which is the *Principle of Immortality*. Yet he sometimes ascribes *Animation* to it, not without *Authority*, as
this

this also is an Ingredient in the *perfect* or *full Man*, who can claim a place in the *πλήρωμα*, as being himself the *Archetypal Ideal Man*.

21.
St. Athanasius
owns the
Natural
Mortality
of the Soul
& ascribes
its actual
Immortality to the
Spirit received from
the *Λόγος*

I have now brought the Tradition down to the *fourth Century*. I shall only add one more; but as great and generally received a *Standard of Orthodoxy*, as any one I know of in that *distance* from the *Apostles*, to this very Day. That is, the great *Athanasius*. He does indeed own the Doctrine of the *Soul's Immortality*, as a *Doctrine* of the *Church*. His Words are plain: "Οτι ὁ καὶ ἀθάνατος γέγονεν ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ τὸτο ἀναγκαῖον εἶδέναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. *Orat. cont. Gent. p. 35.* Nor does any concern of my present Cause oblige me to *Question* his *Truth* in saying so: my present *Dispute* is only whether that same Doctrine of the Church of his *Age* believed it *immortal* of its *own Nature*. And that the *Church* did not so believe it *immortal*, at least, that *Athanasius* did not *think* that this was the *Doctrine* of the *Church* in that *Age*: I think I shall not need a fuller Witness than his *own*. I know no reason to doubt but that he believed *himself* as he knew the *Church* did, in whose Cause he was so great a *Champion*, and so glorious a *Confessor*. And he himself seems very plain, in the Case of its *Natural Mortality*. He owns Mankind ἔχοντες κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν γενέσεως λόγον

λόγον διαμένειν αἰεί. *de Incarn. verb. p. 56.* Accordingly he ascribes all the Hopes of *Immortality* in Man, rather than *other Animals*, to that which is *peculiar* in him, and which no other *Earthly Animal* can pretend to, which the *Scripture* calls the *Image of God*, the ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου, as *Philo* and the *Fathers* call it, as derived from the Λόγος, who is himself the εἰκὼν of the *Father*. By him *God the Father* is said to *secure* Mankind from that *actual Mortality*, to which otherwise the frail *Materials* of his *natural Constitution* would render him obnoxious : μετὰ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ ἰδίον λόγον δυνάμεως ἵνα ὡς περ σκιάς τινος ἔχοντες τὸ λόγον καὶ γενόμενοι λογικοὶ, διαμείνουν μακαριότητι δυνηθῶσι, ζῶντες τὸ ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὅπως τῶν ἁγίων ἐν Παραδείσῳ βίον. This *Happy Life* in *Paradise* had given him, if he had *persisted* in it, a further Title to an *Eternal State of Happiness in Heaven*, of which *Paradise* was only a *Covenanting Symbol*; but *revocable* by his *Misbehaviour*, which depended on his own *Free-will*. This therefore was to be *fixed* as far as was consistent with its *Nature*. And the way taken by *God* for fixing it, was by the *Law* imposed concerning the *Forbidden Fruit*, the *Conditions* whereof are thus expressed by him : ἵνα εἰ μὲν φυλάξανε τὸ χάριν, καὶ ἡκούειεν καλοὶ, ἔχουσι τὸ ἐν Παραδείσῳ ἀλυπὸν καὶ ἀνώδυνον καὶ ἀμέτεμον ζῶν, πρὸς τῷ καὶ τὸ ἐν

ἐν ἔρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίας αὐτὰς ἢ ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχει.
 εἰ δὲ παραβαίεν καὶ ἑσραφέντες γένοιτο φαῦλοι,
 γινώσκωμεν ἑαυτὰς ἢ ἐν θανάτῳ κατὰ φύσιν
 φθορὰν ὑπομένειν, καὶ μηκέτι μὲν ἐν Παραδείσῳ
 ζῆν, ἔξω δὲ τέτε λοιπὸν ἀποθνήσκουσας μένειν ἐν
 τῷ θανάτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ. Thus far he
 supposes us only *enabled* to be *immortal* if
 we please, but still supposes *Death* and *Cor-*
ruption most agreeable to our own *Nature*,
 if deserted by the *Divine Favour*, notwith-
 standing the *Divine Breathing*, which is
 the *Image of God*. Accordingly he ex-
 pounds the *Divine Threat*, θανάτῳ ἀποθα-
 ρείσθε, in case they should break the *Law*
 against the *Forbidden Fruit*, that it means,
 μὴ μόνον ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ τῷ θά-
 νάτῳ φθορᾷ μένειν. And he makes this the
 Event when they had broken it : ἡ παρα-
 βασις τῇ ἐντολῇ εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν αὐτὰς ἐπι-
 στρεφέν, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐκ ὄντες γέγονασιν. ἔτι καὶ
 ἢ εἰς τὸ ἐν φθορᾷ ὑπομείνωσι τῷ χρόνῳ.
 p. 57. And he gives this account of the
 Agreeableness of the *Punishment* to the
Crime committed in the Fall : Εἰκότως
 εἰ γὰρ τύσιν ἔχουσας τὸ μὴ εἶναι ποτε τῇ τῷ λόγῳ
 παρесьία καὶ φιλανθρωπία εἰς τὸ ἐν ἐκλήθησαι,
 ἀκόλεθον ἦν κενωθέντας τὰς ἀνθρώπους τῇ περι-
 δεῖ ἐννοίας καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐκ ὄντα ἀποσραφέντας—
 κενωθῆναι καὶ τῷ ἐν αἰεί. τῷτο δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ δια-
 λυθέντας μένειν ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ τῇ φθορᾷ.
 This cannot be the *Second Death* because it
 is so frequently described by a *ceasing to be*,
 and

and a ceasing to be for ever, never by an *Eternity of Punishment*. Yet it must be understood of the *whole Man*. Otherwise it could be no great Unhappiness to him, if his *Body* perished alone, and his *Soul* (that part of him which alone is capable of being happy) had still *continu'd*, and to *Eternity*.

Yet this kind of *Death*, this Great Man makes *natural* to our whole *Kind*, when divested of *Supernaturals*. He goes on to the same purpose :

Ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνου θνητός· ἅτε δὲ ἐξ ὧν ὄντων γεγονώς.

Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς τὰ ὄντα ὁμοιότηλα, ἣν ἐφύλαττε διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς αὐτὸν κατανόσεως, ἥμβλυεν αὐτὸν κατὰ φύσιν φθοράν, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἀφθαρτός· καθάπερ ἡ σοφία φησὶν· περσοχὴ νόμων βεβαίως ἀφθαρσίας.

He adds his *Authority* for both : why he believed this *Accession* of a *Divine Nature* would *immortalize* Mens Souls ; and why he believed that *without* it they would be *mortal*.

Ἀφθαρτός γὰρ ὢν, ἔζη λοιπὸν ὡς θεός, ὡς πῦρ καὶ ἡ θεῖα γραφὴ τούτο σημαίνει λέγουσα· ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοὶ ἐστέ, καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες· ὑμεῖς γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἀποθνήσκετε, καὶ ὡς εἰς τῶν ἀρχόντων πίπτετε.

Men therefore, who are no more than what that Name entitles them to, must *naturally* die.

And they only *live*, who have what St.

Peter calls the *Divine Nature* ; they πρὸς

τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο. So our *Saviour*

himself expounds this very passage of *Psal.*

lxxxii. 6. in *Joh. x. 35.* as the *Spirit* in us

is

is the εἰκὼν εἰκόν, the Image of him who is the Image of his Father, the Invisible God; the Image of the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, proceeding on the Mystical way of Reasoning from the Old Testament, used in the New. Let any Author of the late Systems shew us as good Authority for his late Notions, if he can. But S. Athanasius goes on; Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Θεὸς ὃς μόνον ἐξ ἑκ ὀντων ἡμᾶς πεποίηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Θεὸν ζῶν ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο τῇ τῷ Λόγῳ χάριτι. Is not this the Gift of God, Eternal Life? Rom. vi. 23. The Blessed Father adds; Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἀποστραφέντες τὰ αἰώνια, καὶ συμβολία τῷ διαβάσει εἰς τὰ τῷ φθορᾷ ὁπστραφέντες, ἐαυτοῖς αἴτιοι τῷ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ φθορᾷ γεγονόσιν ὄντες μὲν κατὰ φύσιν ὡς περὶ πον, φθαροί, χάριτι δὲ τῷ τῷ λόγῳ μέλεισας τῷ κατὰ φύσιν ὁφυγόντες, εἰ μεμνήκεισαν καλοί. Διὰ γὰρ τὸ συνέντα τῷ τοῖς λόγον, καὶ ἡ κατὰ φύσιν φθορὰ τῶν ἐκ ἡγίζε, καθὼς καὶ ἡ σοφία φύσιν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκτίσε τὸ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ ἐκόντα τῷ ἰδίᾳ αἰδιότητι. καθὼς δὲ διαβόλου θανάτῳ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ κόσμον. [Sap. ii. 23, 24.] Τότε δὲ γενομένων οἱ μὲν ἄνθρωποι ἀπὸ θνησκον, ἡ δὲ φθορὰ λοιπὸν κατ' αὐτῷ ἡμαζεν. καὶ πλεον καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἰχύνεσα κατ' ὅλην τῷ γένει, ὅσα καὶ τῷ ἀπειλῶ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ παράβασιν τῷ ἐντολῇ κατ' αὐτῷ περιλήφει. This Disadvantage to our State of Mortality, that follow'd from our Violation of the Law against the Forbidden Fruit, seems to be the same

same that is insisted on by the *Apostle, Rom. viii.* both as by *curbing* our *Appetites*, the *Law* that curbed them made them more outrageous; and, as the *Divine Sentence* of *Death*, threatned in that same *Law*, added to our own *natural* Constitution, brought us under a double necessity of *dying actually*, which to some was necessary only on one account, of our *Frail* and *mortal Nature*. The *event* therefore of this he makes *actual Death*; Διὰ δὲ ταῦτα πλεῖον τῷ θανάτῳ κατήσαντο, καὶ τὴν φθορὰς παραμυθίαν κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὸ μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένεσιν ἐφθείρετο· ὁ δὲ λογικὸς καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γενόμενος ἀνθρώπος ἠφανίσθη· καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγόμενον ἔργον παρ᾽ ὅλῳ, p. 58. The *withdrawing* of the *Divine Image*, the *Principle* of *Immortality* is called ἀφανισμός in opposition to the ἀφάυρωσις, the *obscuring* of it, which is supposed to be the effect of every *sin*. The *Epithets* belong to it as it is called a *Light*, as entitling us to the *inheritance* of the *Saints in Light*. As therefore the ἀφάυρωσις is its *shining darkly*, so as not to be easily discovered; so its ἀφανισμός, seems to imply its utter *disappearing*, which must suppose, if not its *extinction*, yet its *withdrawing* from us, so as to leave us to the *consequences* of our own *mortal Nature*. This he afterwards calls πάλιν εἰς τὸ εἶναι διὰ τὴν φθορὰς ὁπότερ' ἐφείν, p. 59. He afterwards makes this ἀφανισμός the same

G with

with ἀφαιρεσις. So he says of *Mankind* in general, that they were hereby τὴν τῆ κατ' εἰκόνα χάριν ἀφαιρέθέντες, p. 60. This he calls παρὰφανίζετο, also in the same page. So as ἀφανίζειν θανάτον, p. 61, 62. And elsewhere frequently. What can this mean less than a *ceasing to be*, when the only Title to *actual Immortality* is either *withdrawn*, or *extinguished*. This therefore he makes the *difficulty* in the *new design* of God in *restoring Mankind* to the *Immortality* originally *designed* for them. Repentance alone he tells us, would not have been sufficient for it. Why so? Because the utmost *that* it could do, would have been only sufficient to re-instate Mankind in his former *natural Condition*, when *Innocent*. At least, it could not *exalt* him *above* his *Nature*, ὅτε ἡ μετάνοια ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνακαλεῖται, ἀλλὰ μόνον παύει τοῦ ἀμαρτημάτων, p. 59. So that being *left* to his *Nature*, which was *Mortal*, he must have *continued Mortal still*, notwithstanding his *Repentance*. Besides, the *Divine Veracity* obliged him to be *true* to his fore-mentioned *Threats*, of suffering *Nature* to take her course, and not to interpose in an *extraordinary way* for *preventing* it, when there was no *ingredient* in Man which could lay any claim to *Immortality*. So this Holy Person expresses himself: ὅτε τὸ εὐλογον πρὸς τὸ θεὸν ἐφύλαττεν ἡμενε γὰρ πάλιν ἐκ ἀληθείας,

αληθείας, μὴ κεκατεμένων ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τῶν
 ἀνθρώπων, p. 59. Both these *Reasonings* sup-
 pose *actual Mortality* to have been the state
 in which Mankind was reduced by the *Fall*,
 and that *Repentance alone* would not suffice
 for *re-instating* Mankind in the designed *Im-*
mortality, without restoring him to the *Spi-*
rit, the *Divine Principle*, which was *pre-*
ternatural, and had been *lost* by the *Fall*.
 Hereon he grounds the *necessity* why the
 Λόγος was to concern himself in *recovering*
 Man from this *fallen* state, the εἰκὼν *lost*
 was at *first* derived from *him*, and there-
 fore could not be *recovered* unless he was
 pleased to *restore* it. Τινος γὰρ χρεία πρὸς
 τὴν τοιαύτην χάριν καὶ ἀνάκλησιν; ἢ τὸ κατὰ
 τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐκ τῆς μὴ ἐν τοῦ πεποιηκότος τὰ
 ὅλα τῆς θεῆς Λόγου; Αὐτῆς γὰρ ἦν πάλιν καὶ τὸ
 φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνεκῆν, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ
 πάντων εὐλογον ἀποσῶσαι πρὸς τὴν παῖδα.
 Λόγος γὰρ ὢν τῆς πατρὸς, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας ὢν,
 ἀκολούθως καὶ ἀνακλήσας τὰ ὅλας Μόνος ἦν
 δυνατός, p. 60. Whosoever therefore had
 not the *Spirit* restored to him by the Λό-
 γος must, by this *Reasoning*, be *confirmed*
 in his *natural Mortality* by the threatening
 of *death* upon the *Fall*, that *God* might ap-
 prove himself *Veracious*. That he would
immortalize the *Refusers* of the Gospel to *Pu-*
nishment could not be *known* till the Λόγος
 had *declared* his *Pleasure* concerning it,
 who had it in his *own power alone* to give

Life to whom, or as far, as he pleased; or to leave them to their *natural Mortality*. To this he afterwards refers *Ebr. ii. 10.* in p. 62. Accordingly he makes it the Office of the Λόγος, who was himself the εἰκὼν of the Father, to restore the τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου. The words he uses for this purpose are ἀνανεῶσαι, ἀνακαινίσαι, ἀνακτίσαι, p. 66. Because this *Man κατ' εἰκόνα* is the νέα or καινὴ κτίσις, which he makes the same with the ἀναγεννωμένη καὶ ἀνακτιζομένη ψυχὴ. p. 66. He therefore makes it proper to the Λόγος, ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν καὶ ἀνθρώπων νῦν μεταπέσαι, p. 67. and ψυχὴν καὶ νῦν ὁρᾶν, *ib.* Whereby we may understand that the *Minds* as well as the *Souls* of *Men* needed this *Immortality* which none but the Λόγος could confer, which alone could secure them from relapsing to their *natural Mortality*. So he again tells us: Οὐκ ἄλλου ἦν τὸ φθαρὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταβαλεῖν, εἰ μὴ αὐτοῦ Σωτῆρος, τὸ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξ ἑκόντων πεποιηκότος τὰ ὅλα καὶ ἑκ ἄλλου ἦν τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνακτίσαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, εἰ μὴ τοῦ εἰκόντος τὸ πατρὸς καὶ ἑκ ἄλλου ἦν τὸ θνητὸν ἀθάνατον ἀναστήσαι, εἰ μὴ τοῦ Ἀυτοζωῆς ἔσης τὸ κυρίου ἡμετέρου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, p. 72.

22.

The same
S. Athana-

The Controversie with Apollinaris, who made the Λόγος to perform the same Office
sius, and the Catholick Church with him, prove the necessity of our Saviour's assuming even the Supreme part of our Human Souls, against the Apollinarists, that even that might be rescued from actual Mortality.

to *Christ* as our *rational Soul* to us, gave him occasion to be *particular* in asserting the *Mortality* of our *Souls*, since the *Fall* of *Mankind* has reduced us to our *natural Condition*. This Topick he thought necessary to insist on, that he might prove the necessity of *Christ's* assuming a *Humane Soul* as well as a *Humane Body*, in order to the *rescuing* both from the *Mortality* whereto they were *both* sentenced. He therefore asserts the *Souls* to be ἐν δεσμοῖς, which *Bonds* he calls the δεσμοὺς θανάτου. He tells us that *Death* held the *Souls* of *Men* in *Captivity*: θάνατος ὁ περιχύσας ὑπεγάγετο ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀνθρώπινην ψυχὴν εἰς δεσμῶν καὶ ὀχλὴν. He gives a distinct account how the *Soul* comes to be concerned in the sentence of *Death* as well as the *Body*: That as the *Body* is concerned in that part of it, γῆ εἰ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ, So the *Soul* is concerned in the other, θανάτω ἀποθανῆ. *de Incarn. Christ*, p. 626. Here then appears the necessity why *Christ* should assume a *Humane Soul*, that, ὅπου κεχεράτητο ἡ ψυχὴ ἢ ἀνθρώπινη ἐν θανάτῳ, ἐκεῖ ὀπιδείκνυται ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἀνθρώπινην ψυχὴν ἰδίαν ἔσσαν, ἵνα καὶ παρῇ ὡς ἀνθρώπος. ὁ ἀκεράτητος ἐν θανάτῳ, καὶ λύσῃ τὴν κατὰ κράτος τῆς θανάτου ὡς θεός. p. 629, 630. Accordingly he makes our *Lord*, in his *λύτρον* paid for us, to give σῶμα ὑπὲρ σώματος, καὶ ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ τελείαν ὑπαρξιν ὑπὲρ ὅλης ἀνθρώπου. He makes it no compleat Victory over

Death, if the Soul, which sinned κατὰ φρόνησιν, knowingly and designedly (which the Body could not do) should not share in it: Πῶς ἡ κρεάτησις τῷ θανάτῳ τελείαν ἐλάβανε τὴν λύσιν, εἰ τὸ κατὰ φρόνησιν ἁμαρτήσαν, τὴν ψυχὴν χειρὸς ἀναμάρτητον ἔσυνεψήσατο αὐτῷ: Τί ἐν καὶ ὑμᾶς, βασιλεύει ὁ θάνατος τῷ ἔσωθεν ἀνθρώπῳ; Τίνος γὰρ ἄλλου, καὶ ἐβασίλευσέ ποτε: ἐχὶ ψυχῆς τῇ ἐν φρονήσει ἁμαρτητάσῃ; καὶ ὡς ἐρήται, ψυχὴ ἡ ἁμαρτάνουσα αὐτὴ καὶ ἀποθανεῖται ὑπὲρ ἧς τὴν ἰδίαν ψυχὴν τέθεικεν ὁ Χειρὸς λυτὴν ἀντιδιδόναι. p. 631. He takes occasion also, from the same Hereticks, to give his Opinion of the Ψυχὴ and Πνεῦμα, the very same which is thought so Unscriptural and Uncatholick. The νοεῖα ἀνθρώπου φύσις is, with him, the same with ψυχὴ. This some had called σαρκικὴν. Against whom he reasons thus: Πόθεν μαθόντες ἔσυνεπίσταται. Οὔτε γὰρ ἐν τῇς ἁγίων γραφῶν ἔστιν εὑρεῖν τῷτο, ἔτε ἐν τῷ κοιῷ τῇς ἀνθρώπων λογισμῷ, τῷ Κυρίῳ λέγοντος, Μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῇς ἀποκλείοντων τὸ σῶμα τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι. Καὶ πῶς, εἰ σαρκικὴ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ὑμᾶς, ἔσυνεπίσταται τῷ σώματι καὶ συμφθερεῖται; Πῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος τὰς ἐν αἵδου κατεχομένας ψυχὰς πρὸς εὐμαλῶς ὀνομάσας ἔλεγεν, ἐπορεύθη τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ κατὰ κεκλησμένοις πνεύμασιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν. p. 639, 640. The σαρκικὴ ψυχὴ is here plainly opposed to the πνευματικὴ, and for that Reason is suppo-

supposed as capable of being killed by Men, as the *Body* it self, when that *Soul* is supposed destitute of the *Spirit*, which can alone secure it from the *actual Mortality*, which is also supposed to be *natural* to it. On the other side, the *Souls* in *Prison* mentioned by *S. Peter*, are therefore observed to be called *Spirits*, as being otherwise incapable of *subsisting* in *Adns*, the *Prison* of *separated Souls*, as necessarily returning to their *natural Mortality* if they had nothing *Spiritual* in them; which is that *alone* from which they derive all the *actual Immortality* they can pretend to. Here therefore we have this glorious Champion of the *Catholick Church*, and the *Church* of his *Age*, fully of our mind, in opposition to the *Heresie* of *Apollinaris*. I might pursue this further, through the other *Writers* against that same *Heresie*; and to *lower Authorities* of *later Ages*; but I think what I have said sufficient, as being really the *best Authority*, and what ought to be the *Standard* of *future Ages*.

In truth, these *Notions* of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ and $\piνεῦμα$, in the Sense now explained, seem to have been as notorious in the *Ecclesiastical Disputes* of these *Ages*, as any other *Technical Terms* derived from the *Scriptures*. The *Gnostical Enthusiasts* of all
This Distinction between the Soul and Spirit supposed in the Disputes with the Hereticks from the days of the Apostles themselves.

sorts insisted on them, and indeed grounded all their Pretensions to their *Gnosis* on their *Appropriations* of the *Spirit* to their own Parties. Indeed, they meant, by their *Gnosis*, that *Knowledge of Divine Mysteries*, which none could lay claim to, but *spiritual Men*, by the *Reasonings* of *S. Paul* himself, as well as of the *Mystical Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* of those *Ages*. On this they grounded their Claim to the *Pleroma*, the Place appropriated to the *Divine God*, which was no other than the *Spirit*. The *Pleroma* was indeed the same with *Heaven*, the place of *Immortal Beings*, their *Æons*, the same with the *Platonick Ideæ*, as *Tertullian* observes. In Opposition to the *Emptiness* and *Appearance*, and *Falseness* of *Sublunary Beings*. And they thought it the Office of *Horus* to keep out all *Psychical Men* from thence, as not being *οὐρανῶντες εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. To such, if they behave themselves well, they allowed a Place of Reward in the *Status Medietatis*, between the *Pleroma*, and the Place of the *Punishment* of the *Devils*, that is, between *Heaven* and *Tartarus*. The *third* sort of *Men*, the *Choical*, of the *χῆς*, the *Dust* of the *Earth*, in the *Greek Interpreters*, they thought *extinguished* with their *Bodies*, and therefore had no Concern to provide a *future State* for them. So *Tertullian*, on Pretence of defending the *Spirit* of *Montanus*

nus and his *Prophetesses*, calls the *Catholicks Psychicos*, as *destitute* of the *Spirit*, because they did not allow of his *Paraclete*. And this seems to have been the Plea of the *Enthusiastick Hereticks*, from the Days of the *Apostles* themselves. S. *Jude* seems plainly to allude to them, v. 19. Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιόριζοντες ἑαυτὰς, ψυχικοὶ, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. He intimates the *Horus*, by which they thought their Station in the *Pleroma* distinguished and separated from the *Status Medietatis*, the Station by them assigned to the *Catholicks*, as being only *Psychici*, and *destitute* of the *Spirit*, of which themselves boasted. On the contrary, S. *Jude* implies the ἀποδιόρισμός, to be only in their own Fancies, and *denies* their Claim to the *Spirit*, turning the Charge of being *Psychical* on themselves, which they had fixed on the *truly Catholick Church*. He grants therefore the ἀποδιόρισμός, to the *truly Spiritual*, and that the *Psychical* have no *Right* to it. Only he denies the *appropriating Application* of those great *Rights* to *them*. He asserts, as he very reasonably might, the *truly Apostolical Spirit* to the genuine *Sons and Successors* of the *Apostles*; which did, in *Consequence*, overthrow their Pretensions to the *Spirit*, who opposed and undermined the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles*, and left them in the State of being only *Psychical*. And
 pursuant

pursuant to this Claim of the *Spirit* to the
Catholick Apostolick Church, in Opposition
 to these *false Brethren*, the *true Church*
 challenged also *true Gnosis*, as the excellent
Dr. Hammond has observed in many places,
 but especially in that famous Passage of *S. Paul*,
 where he stiles the contrary Boasts
 of the Adversaries *ψευδογνῶσις*. This
 the *Gnosticks* themselves understood as so
 designed against their own Cause; so that
 they therefore *denied* the Authority of this
Epistle, as we are assured by *Clemens Alex-*
andrinus, *Strom. ii. p. 165*. This I take
 for a certain Conviction of their Mistake,
 who will allow nothing in that *Key* for un-
 derstanding the Writings of the *New Testa-*
ment, so much insisted on by that very
pious, as well as *learned Doctor*, whose
 Memory ought always to be had in Ho-
 nour in our Church, to which he was so
 great an Ornament. And accordingly
Clemens Alexandrinus himself challenges
 the Title of the *ἀληθὴς γνῶσις*, to the truly
Catholick Church. So far the truly *Ortho-*
dox Christians, even of those Ages, were
 from disapproving this Language, and these
 Opinions, even of the Innovators them-
 selves. In that indeed they did differ
 from them, that they did not make the
Divine Ingredient connatural to the Soul, as
 its first Constitution; and that the *Ortho-*
dox condemned the *Hereticks* for believing

it *connatural*, and look'd on *this* Belief of theirs, as the *Characteristick* of their *Heresy*. And the *Consequence* hereof would then be, that the *Catholicks* must believe the *Soul* mortal in its own *Nature*, when they did not believe this only *Principle* of *Immortality* *connatural* to it. And withal, that the *Doctrine* which made the *Principle* of *Immortality* *connatural* to the *Soul* in its *first* *Essential* *Constitution*, and thereby made the *Soul* *naturally* *Immortal*, was then taken for *Heretical* in those *first* *Heresies*, which *first* made a discession from the *Catholick* *Communion*, immediately after the decease of the *Apostles*. And here is also an *Authority*, far beyond that of *Cartes*, proving something *distinct* from *Spirit*, *Matter* and *Motion*. These *Holy* *Fathers* believed the *Soul* it self to be so. And the *modern* *Peripateticks*, had the same *Opinion* of *Material* *Forms*. Nor has that *Philosopher* demonstrated the contrary, that there cannot be an *active* *substantial* *Principle*, *distinct* from *Matter*, yet depending on *Matter* in *esse*, in *feri*, in *operari*, and which must accordingly be *dissolved* on the *dissolution* of that *Matter* on which it depends. If *Distinction* of *Conceptions* would do it, that would as well prove the *separate* *Subsistence* of the *Divine* *Attributes* which do as little include each other in their mutual *Conceptions* as the *Conception* of

a material Form can be pretended to include the Conception of Matter.

24.
The Doctrine of
the natural
Mortality
of the Soul
thus explained,
can have
no ill influence
on our present
Practice.

It is withal a further consideration for removing *Prejudices* against this *Doctrine*, that it leaves all *Obligations*, relating to *Practice*, as firm as it finds them. *Criminals* can derive no Confidence for *persevering* in their ill Courses from the *natural Mortality* of their own Souls whilst they are withal assured that they shall be *actually Immortal*. No more than they can promise their *Bodies* any ease in their *Eternal Torments* after the Day of *Judgment*, because their *Bodies* are, without question, *Mortal naturally*, if God had been pleased to leave them so their own *Nature*. His *actually immortalizing* their *Bodies* to *Punishment* makes their Case as formidable in that regard as if they had been *Immortal* of their own *Nature*. The Case is the same with their *Souls*. Their *actual Immortality* is also sufficient for *eternizing* their *Pain*. And their *actually* subsisting after the *Death* of their *Bodies* exposes them to the same *sufferings*, even in the *interval* between their *Death* and *Resurrection*, as their *natural Immortality* would. So that their *sufferings* will be as long on these, as on the more received, Principles. Thus none who are concerned in these *Punishments* can gather any *security* to themselves from this *Doctrine* of the *Souls natural Mortality* thus

ex.

explain'd. All that can be pretended, is, That *fewer* will be *concerned* in them than are commonly conceived to be. And that, methinks, should rather be taken for an *Advantage* than an *Inconvenience*, if none be hereby tempted to *believe* themselves *secure*, when really they are not so. And of that there is no danger. They who are really *secure*, by these *Principles*, are they who *never heard*, nor *could hear*, of the *Gospel*: All they, in *general*, who lived before the *new Revelation* mention'd by *S. Paul*, obliging *all Men*, from *that time* forward, of whatsoever *place* or *Nation*, to *receive* the *Gospel* as soon as it should be sufficiently *promulged* and *proposed* to them. But this is no *concern* of the *Age* we live in. Nor is it possible that any one *now* can hear of the *Doctrine* I am speaking of, without *hearing* of the *Gospel* too, because it is *argued* as the *Doctrine* of the *Gospel*. This being so, there will follow this, I think, an *avoidable dilemma*: They who *never heard* of this *Doctrine*, cannot possibly *make* any *ill use* of it; and they who *do* hear of it, must also hear of the *Gospel*, and therefore cannot promise themselves any *security*, if they still *continue* refractory, for that very *Reason*, because they must be *supposed* to have *heard* of the *Gospel*. They therefore can promise themselves, by these *Principles* *no Security* at all. How then
can

can they be flattered into a *false security*? Their only *true Security* is, to be *warned* of their *Danger* before it be irremediable; and that will best appear by letting them see how far *their Case* is from the Case of *them*, who can expect any *relief* from this *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of our *Human Souls*. Where then is the *danger*? where is the *abuse*, that can be made of this *Doctrine*, by them that *hear* it and impartially consider it? I can foresee none that can be, by any *rational Consequence*. And no *rational Person* will make any responsible for *Consequences* that *himself* believes *irrational*.

25. The great *difficulty* of this Question lies in this, whether the *immortalizing Principle* was originally *designed* by God for an *Ingredient* of *Human Nature* in general? or, whether it was *intended* by God *himself* as a *separable Favour* for *some Men*, which he reserved in his own arbitrary *Pleasure*, whether he would confer it on *others*? If it had been an *essential Ingredient* in *Human Souls*, they must *all* of them indeed be *necessarily Immortal*. And the *Consequence* would be, That, if their *separate State* be a state of *Rewards* or *Punishments*, those *Rewards* and *Punishments* must likewise be *Eternal*. But there were but *few* of this *Opinion*. The *popular Heathens* believed only their *first Ancestors* to have been *Gods*, their

The Immortalizing Principle was generally believed no ingredient in the Nature of the Human Soul, among the Heathens themselves.

their *next* to have been *Heroes* or *Demi-gods*, and the *later* generations to have been *pure Men*. Unless the *supreme Being* were *pleased* (even in the *degenerous Ages*) to confer the *nobler Principle* on some choice *Favourites*, as *Princes*, or other remarkable *Benefactors of Mankind*. Thence came the *Divine Honours* to *Founders of Colonies*, to remarkable *Princes*, to the *Roman Emperours* in course, to *Philosophers*, especially those that were *Theurgical*, and *Favourites of Princes*, as *Caligula's Sisters*, and *Hadrian's Antinous*. The *Pythagoreans* also seemed of the same *Opinion*, if we may judge of their *Sentiments* by the *Golden Verses*. They there own their *Immortal Gods*, their *Heroes*, and their *Earthly Dæmons*, of which their *Immortal Gods* alone were supposed to have the *Immortalizing Divine Principle*, which entitled them to *Heaven*, the *place of the Immortal Gods*. The *Heroes* were confined to the *Air*, and the *Earthly Dæmons* to the *Earth*. But these differences seem only imputable to the *different use* of their *Free wills* in keeping the same *Divine Principle* more or less *pure*. That qualified them for a *higher* or a *lower Region*, as giving them more or less of the *Wing* which enabled them to mount *higher* or *lower*. So we must understand them to reconcile them with the *Platonists*, who followed the *Pythagoreans* in their *Theology*.
For

For Plato's *Timæus*, is only the Doctrine of *Timæus Locrus* the Pythagorean, as appears by comparing both their Books still extant. And indeed both of these suppose *Human Souls* to be of a *Cælestial Original*, and to have a tendency thither again. Which must be on account of this *Superiour Divine Principle* which themselves own for the only *Wing* that can mount them thither. Hence their Discourses concerning the *descent* of their Souls by some *Signs* of the *Zodiack*, and their *return* by other *Signs*. Plainly implying that the *Exile* of Souls was from the *Sun*, as the $\kappa\epsilon\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ of Νῦς or Λόγος, the upper and Diviner part of the Soul, whose proper course was in the *Zodiack*, which is in *Heaven*, properly so called, in a contradiction to those Regions which was reckon'd as $\sigma\upsilon\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\omicron\iota$, or *Subcælestial*. So *Macrobius* in his excellent Commentary on *Tully's Somnium Scipionis*. And *Porphyrus* makes this Opinion as old as *Homer* himself, one of the *eldest* Fountains of *Greek Traditions*. For so he expounds the Fragment *de antro Nympharum* of that Prince of Poets. And indeed very ingeniously, so as to make it probable that *Homer* himself might mean so. And indeed *Hesiod*, the Contemporary of *Homer*, reckons the like degrees of the degeneracy of Souls from their first Original. So that, by this account, all Souls were supposed to have this *Divine Principle*

Principle connatural to them. And these degrees of their separate state would only answer the *ωλεσπρόνοια*, the flagging of this Divine Wing, occasion'd by the Corporeal Faculencies, contracted by them in their preceding Lives. Nor did these general accounts hinder, but that particular Persons, even in the later more degenerate Ages, might raise themselves above the ordinary pitch of their Coævals, by a better use of their own Free-will, and by Purgations of these worldly Pollutions. The Mysteries were thought one Expedient for clearing Souls of the *βόρβορες*, as Plato calls it of Matter, which clogged the Wings, and added to the load that was to be raised by them. Philosophy was thought another, for subduing the Passions, those *ἑλαι*, the Nails of the Soul to Matter, as the same Plato calls them, and by spiritualizing their Souls by an *ἐπιθεωρη*, that is their word, to Divine and Immaterial Objects, the Heavenly Beings; and Mathematicks, to which they also ascribed much for facilitating their return, because they also were separate from Matter. Besides the two great changes of the *Annus Magnus*, of the Platonick revolution, which was to restore all things to the same State wherein they were at first (that was their *ἀποκατάστασις*) restored in course, two great External Purgations. As the common Year has a Winter wherein the moist Principle

H

ciple

ciple prevails, and a Summer wherein the hot is predominant; so every *Platonick Year* was thought to bring with it a *Revolution* of *Inundations* and *Conflagrations*, both of them of a *Purgative* Nature. Indeed, all their ordinary *Lustrations* were by those Elements of *Water* and *Fire*. Withal there are the *intermediate* Purgations of the *fiery Rivers* mention'd by *Plato* in his *Adm.* For these also he thought *Purgative*, but in a greater or lesser time, according to the degrees and aggravations of the contracted *Pollutions*. But those could be only for the *Time* that the *Souls* so purged were supposed not to be in other *Bodies*. Thus there were provided *Purgatives* that might in course, fit *Souls* for the beginning of a new *Revolution*. They who were willing to purge themselves, might, by the good use of their own *Free-will*, gain *Heaven* sooner, and enjoy it longer, at least, to the end of that great *Year* wherein they were born: But they who were not willing to purge themselves, if they were to be purged by the now mentioned external involuntary *Purgations*; they could have no hopes of *Heaven* immediately after their *Death* till they had undergone the *Purgations* to which they were condemned by the *Governours* of *Adm.* if their *Crimes* were of that nature as to be indeed capable of a *Purgation*. Indeed, that could not be expected, unless the *Crimes*

of all the *Transmigrations* they were to undergo through the whole *Platonick Year* proved *expiable*. But *Plato* owned that some *Crimes* were *aviaia*. If this were simply true, such *Souls* could never expect a *Restitution*, but must be lost for ever, as to that *Divine Celestial Life* for which they were at first designed. So the *Revolutions* would not restore things to the same state wherein they were before. And there must be new *Souls* sent down in their stead in the next *Revolution*. And this variety must, in an infinite number of *Revolutions*, make a great change in the *Uniformity* by which they conceived each *Revolution* should be transacted. For avoiding this, they might own a greater *Purgative Virtue* in the *Revolutional Conflagration* than in the ordinary *Fires of Aens*. This expedient might fit all to act their parts again in the new Scene, when the *Wicked* as well as the *Good*; were thus at last to receive their *Expiation*. And so it must be, if *Saturn* was again to govern in the *Golden Age*, and the *Titans* and the *Giants* were to act the parts they had done formerly. They must all in course be dismissed from their *Chains* and *Confinement to Tartarus*. This is the *Consequence* of the *Immortality* of *Human Souls* on this *Hypothesis*, that no part of the *Divine Seed* might perish finally, if all *Human Souls* were thus far, at least, believed to be

of a *Divine Extradition*, not as the Notion of *Divine* might entitle them to *infinite Perfection*, but as it might, at least, entitle them to *Immortality* and *Heaven*, as *αἰὼν ἰόντες* and *Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες* are both of them *Epithets* of *Gods*, in this *lower* Notion, in the most antient *Poets*. These Notions of the *Traditional* travelling *Philosophers* seem to have influenc'd *Origen*, in deriving our *Human Souls* into *Earthly Bodies* from a state of *præexistence* in *Heaven*; and in allowing a *Purgation* of *damned Spirits*, and the *Devils* themselves, in the *Fire* of the *Conflagration*; and in making all purely *Human Souls* equal in this claim to *Immortality*. He might possibly have learned them from those *Heathen* Authors whom *Porphyry* pretends to have been his Guides in his *Mystical* Interpretation of the *Scriptures*. See *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 19.*

26.
The Primitive
Christians dis-
liked the
Doctrine
of the nat-
ural Im-
mortality
of the Soul
in Origen
and others,
and Rea-
soned on
Principles
inconsistent
with the
belief of it.

However among the *Christians*, this Do-
ctrine of *Origen* was taken for very singular.
Nor did the great Authority of the *Man*
recommend it to many among them. They
generally condemn'd it in *Plato* himself.
They generally took it for a *Maxim* in Ar-
guing, That whatever had a *Beginning* could
not be necessarily or naturally *Immortal*. On
this Principle they owned none *Immortal*
but *God* himself. No, not the *Angels*. So
far they were from admitting the *Cartesian*
Principle, that every *Substantial Principle*
of

of Motion, distinct from Matter, must thus be a Spirit, and Immortal in its own Nature. So far, even from the Doctrine of the modern Schoolmen, from the Arabian Peripatetic Philosophy. In truth, the Heathens themselves were not so unanimous in it. Plutarch himself gives the Mortality even of the Dæmons themselves for a Cause of the cessation of some Oracles. And Aristotle makes the immortal Soul *ὑσώδης*, from without, as not ingredient in the constitution of Mankind in general, very agreeably to our Scriptures and Fathers, now described. I do not mention those Heathens who were not favourable to Religion. The Apostle himself speaks agreeably to this Reasoning: *Οὐκ ἔχον ἀθανάσιαν*, 1 Tim. vi. 16. as being the *αὐτοαθανασία* from whom all, that will pretend to Immortality, must derive it, not from their own Nature. It is another Principle with them, That nothing that is possible can be Immortal. And they charge the Platonists with being inconsistent with themselves, when they make Human Souls Immortal in their own Nature, and yet make them imprisoned in Bodies, and subject to all those other Infelicities that follow thereupon. They accordingly prove from Scripture, that the Soul of the rich Man in the Parable, must have been Corruptible and Corporeal, because he suffered the Torments there mentioned. At least, that it could

not be *Immortal* in its own *Nature*. They thence *disprove* the *Immortality* of the *Heathen Gods* themselves, because of their *sufferings*, owned and commemorated by their own *Worshippers*. How then could they consequently own the *natural Immortality* of *damned Souls*, when yet themselves believed them liable to such exquisite *Torments*, even from *corporeal Fire*? And that, as well in a *separate State*, as when they were *again* to be reunited to their *Bodies*. These the *Christians* took for *self-evident Principles* that could *not* be *denied* then, whatever their later *Successors* think of the same *Principles*. Accordingly they condemn these *same Doctrines* in the *Gnosticks*, those *earliest of Hereticks*, that they made their own *Souls naturally Pneumatical*, and consequently *Immortal* of their own *Nature*. And yet owned themselves liable to such *sufferings* as required such difficult contrivances, as themselves pretended for their own *restoration*. So they upbraided them with the *sufferings* of the *Sophia*, the *Heavenly Aeon* in the *Pleroma*, as utterly *inconsistent* with that *Divinity of Nature* which they ascribed to her. Yet those very same *sufferings*, by their *Principles*, gave occasion for all that *Pneumatical Seed* which they thought propagated in this *lower World*, for whose *reduction* to the *Pleroma* their whole *Hypothesis* was fitted. Nor could they

they also be of an *immortal Nature*, if *sufferings* be an Argument to the contrary. And for this same reason the *Catholick Church* of that Age could not believe the *separate Souls Immortal* in their own *Nature*, because they believed *ill Souls* under such *sufferings*, and that from a *corporeal Agent*, the *Fire of Hell*. I hear very well, that *both* are believed now: both that our *separate Souls* are *immortal* in their own *Nature*; and that they are, notwithstanding that, *capable* of those same *Punishments* from that same *Fire*. And I have mentioned the *Concessions*, of that *Nature*, among the *Heathens*, that *might* and probably *did*, dispose them afterwards to *believe* these two *Assertions reconcileable*, who had a reverence for the *Authority* of the *Heathen Philosophers*, as the *Gnosticks* even then had. I only say, That this *Reasoning* could not have been admitted by the *Catholick Church*, who differed from the *Doctrine* of those *Philosophers* in this very *particular*; and who *confuted* them in things of the *greatest* importance, relating to their *Popular Gods*, by this *Principle*, that whatever was *passible* could not, for that *Reason*, be *Immortal* in its own *Nature*, because *Passion* naturally tended to *dissolution*. This *Principle* they took for so *self evident*, as that they made it a *Criterion* for *Gods* and *Æons*. And they insisted on it as a *Characteristick* in opposi-

tion to both the *Heathen Philosophers*, and their own *Gnostick Hereticks*. They could not therefore admit the modern reconciliations of *Passibility* with *natural Immortality*. The same is also supposed in their deriving all *Immortality* both of the *Soul* and *Body*, from the *πνεῦμα*. They could not have done so, if they had not believed that the *Soul* alone, was of its own *Nature Immortal*.

27. The Immortality if the Soul is a Revelation of the Gospel. And therefore not capable of being proved by Reason from the Nature of the Soul in itself.

In truth, the *Doctrine* even of the *Soul's actual Immortality*, seems neither to have that *Evidence of Reason or Tradition* for it, as not to need a new *Revelation* of the *Gospel*, for recommending it to the *Universal* belief of *Mankind*, at least with that assurance as was requisite for the *Practice* which *Religion* requires, pursuant to the *Belief* of it. At least as to the giving us that *immortal Life* in *Heaven*. That I take to be the true Importance of those words of the *Apostle*:

συγκρατοῦσθαι τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ δύναμιν θεῶν, τὸ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς, καὶ καλέσθαι ἡμᾶς ἐν ἁγίᾳ, καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν πορεύεσθαι, καὶ χάριν τιμὴν διδόντες ἡμῖν ὡς Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ περὶ χρίτων αἰωνίων φανερωθεῖσαν ὃ νῦν διὰ τῆ ὑποφανείας τῆ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀργήσαντες μὴ τὸ θάνατον, φωτισθῶμεν ὃ ζωὴ καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 2 Tim. i. 8, 9, 10. *Αφθαρσία* and *ἀθανασία* are the same thing in the Reasonings of this same *Apostle*, 1 Cor. xv. The *Life* therefore

fore that is joyned with it must be that which is *Immortal*, at least in *Fact*. This is said $\phi\omega\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota$ in the Gospel, and that by *Christ*. Plainly alluding to the *Inheritance incorruptible, that fadeth not away, of the Saints in light*. And this *Immortality* being from the *Spirit* (as I have already shewn) which is the *Spirit of Christ*, and which is accordingly given in our *Saviour's Baptism* as the only *ordinary means* appointed by our Saviour *himself* for our *receiving* it at *first*: who can doubt but that our *Right* to an *immortal Happiness in Heaven* must *commence* from the time of our *Baptism*? That is imply'd by the name of $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ as used for *Baptism*, not only by the *earliest Fathers*, but by this our *Apostle* himself in his *Epistle to the Ebrews*. But our State before *Baptism* is represented as a State of $\alpha\chi\omicron\rho\tau\omicron$ in opposition to the *Baptismal* $\phi\omega\varsigma$, or $\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ in opposition to the *Spirit* as it is stiled $\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and particularly of $\alpha\gamma\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ in opposition to the $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ the *knowledge of Mysteries, or Divine Secrets*, which was taken for the *Gift of the Spirit*, and therefore appropriated to the *Spiritual Man*, 1 Cor, ii. 15. These are the *deep things of God*, v. 10. the *things of God*, v. 11. the *things which are freely given to us of God*, v. 12. the *mind of the Lord, and of Christ*, v. 16, which the *Psychical Man* receives not, v. 19. but the *Spirit of God*, any more than any one can know

know the things of a *Man*, save the *Spirit* of a *Man* which is in him, v. 11. because they are *spiritually* discerned, v. 14. The *Immortality* therefore of the *Soul*, at least in *Heaven*, is here plainly supposed *not* to be known without *Divine Revelation*. Which could not be admitted as true, if there were *Reasons* that could prove it *actually* true, if it could be proved by *Reasons* drawn from the Nature of the *Soul*, as known to us in this *Life*, *antecedently* to *Divine Revelation*. Those *Reasons* would make it *known* to them who never had *heard* of *Revelation*, if the *Reasons* were so *evident* as our *Adversaries* pretend. But, proceeding on the *Principles* already insisted on, it is indeed a *Subject* of *Divine Revelation*, and could *not* have been otherwise *known* with that *certainty* that might support the *Practice* which *Religion* expects in consequence of it. *Nature* alone is not sufficient to make the *Soul* *Immortal* without the *Spirit*, which *God* was at liberty to give or refuse till he was pleased to promise it. And this *Promise* is the *mind* of *God*, and can no more be *known* without the *Revelation* of the *Spirit*, than the *mind* of a *Man* can be discovered by any other *Man*, without the intervention of the *Spirit* of the *Man*, whose *Mind* it is. This *Spirit* therefore is the $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ so celebrated throughout the whole *New Testament*, as well as in this place. And it is called a
Gift

Gift for that very reason, that we might thereby understand that it is not due to our *Human Nature*. And χάρις because it is designed for *Favourites* of God, not for such as can lay no other claim to Divine Favour, is, in the *Hebrew* Idiom, expressed by finding favour in the sight of God, which is the same with εὐρίην χάριν in the *Greek*. And they who do so, are the fairest Candidates for such Gifts, as are taken for the peculiar Indications of any Princes Favour. This seems to be the meaning of the *Apostles*, and the *Apostolical Writers*, when they wish and congratulate the Increase of this χάρις to the Churches and Persons to whom they write. They mean the Gifts and Graces of this *Heavenly Spirit*, which from this χάρις are called χαρίσματα. So the Blessed *Virgin* is said to be κεχαριτωμένη when she was overshadowed by the Spirit. So χάρις and Ἀλήθεια are said to be given by *Christ*, in opposition to the Law given by *Moses*. Because the *Apostle* tells us expressly, that the Spirit was not given by the Works of the Law, but by the Obedience of Faith. It is there called Ἀλήθεια, not in contradistinction to Ψεῦδος (as when it is opposed to opposite Christian Communion) but to the Σκία, the visible Symbol of the *Schechinah*, which represented the Spirit in the Legal Consecrations of the *Tabernacle* and the *Temple*. As the *Sun* in the *Firmament*

ment is called the *true Sun*, in opposition to a *Parhelius* in the *Clouds*, or in a *River*. And this name of *χάρις* is given it to shew, that, as none of the *external ritual Works* of the *Law* did *deserve* it, so neither did they *confer* it. So that *God* was still at perfect *liberty* whether he would confer it on the *Legally Righteous*, notwithstanding the *Obligations* he had been pleased to lay upon himself by his *Legal Covenant*. So far it is from being supposed *due* to the *rest* of *Mankind*, who could pretend no *Covenant* with *God* at all, not even that of the *Law*. This therefore being the *Principle* of *Immortality*, but not *natural* to *Mankind* in *general*; it must follow that the *Souls* of *Mankind* (cannot be *immortalized* but by this *Spirit*) cannot be *immortal* in their own *Nature*, by this *Reasoning* from *Scripture* and *Catholick Tradition*. It follows also that even this *actual Immortality* could not be *actually known* till *God* was pleased, by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*, to discover his *actual* design of giving us his *Immortalizing Spirit*.

28. And that this was really the *Case*, appears further, in that the *Doctrine* of the *Sadducees* was not *condemned* by any *publick Sentence* of the *Jewish Church*, as certainly it would have been if it had been *inconsistent* with the *Immortality* of *Human Souls*, yet) knew of no *Divine Revelation* that might assure them of it.

Even the
Jews of the
Apostles
Age (tho'
many of
them be-
lieved the

any

any *Divine Revelation* of the *Old Testament* ; At least, if it had been so in the *Opinion* of the *Jewish Sanhedrim*. What the *Doctrine* of that *Sect* was, *S. Luke* assures us, That they *denied* the very *being* of either *Angel* or *Spirit*, *Act. xxiii. 6*. And what is the meaning of *Spirit* here, as it is joyned with *Angel*, is manifest from what has been already observed. It is that *Immortalizing Spirit*, which makes us *ἰσχυροὺς*, that is, *Immortal*, and entitled to *Heaven*, as well as the *Angels* are. That same *Spirit* indeed, by which the *Angels* themselves are entitled to *Immortality* and their *οἰκητήριον* in *Heaven*, as being themselves *πνεύματα πονηρίας*, or *δαιμόνια*, by their *participation* of that *Spirit*. By which *Christ* himself is said to be the *Head* of *Angels*, and *Principalities* and *Powers*, as he is said to be the *Head* of *Men*, as inhabitable by that same *Spirit*, which is called the *Spirit* of *Christ*, and *Christ* in us, the *hope* of *Glory*, that is, of that *Glory*, which is *Eternal* in the *Heavens*. This therefore obliged them to deny the actual *Immortalizing* of either *Angels* or *Human Souls*, when they *denied* them both that *Spirit* which could alone *immortalize* them. Yet they had their share in the *Sanhedrim*, were qualified for the *High-Priesthood* it self. So far they were from the least note of *Infamy*, on account of their holding this *Opinion*. This could not have been if the *Jewish Church*

Church had believed, even the *actual Immortality of Human Souls* to have been as clear a *Revelation of the Old Testament*, as we believe it to be of the *New*. They therefore who lived *nearest to the time of those Texts*, which are now commonly produced for proving the *Immortality of the Soul*, did not so understand them as we do, at least were not so *assured* as we are, that the *Holy Ghost* did so *intend* them. How could this have been if those *Texts* had been as clear in the *Case*, as we are sure those are of the *New Testament*? And how could they have been clear, if they, for whose *Capacities* the *Old Testament* was fitted, did not so *understand* them, nor found any *received Tradition* from their *Ancestors*, even *then*, which might oblige them to *believe* the *Doctrine* True; if not as the *sence* of those *Texts*, yet as a *Tradition* received originally from *God*, by their *Ancestors*? But really the *Opinions* then received among the *Jews* are a sufficient conviction that they *knew* of no *Divine Revelation* concerning the *future State of the Soul*. Even the most *Spiritual Sect* of all, that of the *Essenes*, contented themselves with the *popular Opinions* received among the *Heathens* concerning the *Elysian Fields* in the *Fortunate Islands* in the *Ocean*, if we may believe *Josephus*. What then may we expect from the *other Parties* whose *genius* was more *gross and sensual*? The
Pha-

Pharisees, the *ἀρχαῖοι αἰσίου*, as to the Externals of the Ceremonial Law, owned no other Rewards of the Good but a Transmigration into good Bodies, nor any other Punishments of the Wicked than those of the fiery Rivers. Here was nothing in either of these Hypotheses, but what they might have learned from the Pagans without any Divine Revelation; nothing that could be learned from any Divine Tradition, or any probable Interpretation of the Scriptures; nothing that argues any Life, even of the Soul it self, in Heaven; nothing that supposes it to survive the World, or to continue the same to the Resurrection; nothing that shews why it might not then be re-produced as well as the Body; nothing at all that would prove it Immortal, even in their Opinion, though it might survive the dissolution of our gross organical Bodies. Nor are their received Notions, alluded to in the Gospel, any better. The Kingdom of Heaven expected by them was a Kingdom wherein they were to eat and drink; wherein they were to lie in Abraham's Bosom, alluding plainly to the accubitus of Favourites in the bosoms of their Principals, then received in their Festival Entertainments; a marrying and being given in marriage, as in the Story of the Woman married to the seven Brethren: a restoring the Kingdom to Israel, and a sitting at

at the *right hand* and the *left hand* of the *Messias*, and their *ruling* of each other, as even the *Apostles* themselves expected till they were better informed by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. Nothing of all this supposed a state in *Heaven*, properly so called, or a state *Immortal*; but rather the *restoring* after a *Platonical* Revolution. Nothing therefore supposed a *Spirit* given to them then, that might either *raise* them from *Earth* to *Heaven*, or continue them to an *immortal* duration. They could not have been so *irresolute*, and so different among *themselves*, and so *exactly* agreeable to the *Opinions* of those who did *not* so much as *pretend* to *Revelation*, if themselves could have pleaded a *Divine Testimony*. The *Christians* were *not* thus uncertain, and divided, when this matter was cleared by a *Revelation*, which was *acknowledged* by them all. What can be the reason of this *difference*, but that the *Revelation* of the *Gospel* was indeed the *first* Divine Revelation that settled it? This perfectly agrees with what I observed formerly, concerning the *warning* given to the *Heathens* by *S. Paul*. God *winked* at them, and *suffered* them to go on in their *own ways*, in their *omission* of what had otherwise been their *Duty* to the *Supreme Being*, till he *acquainted* them that it was his *Pleasure* to *make* them *Immortal*, and to *judge* them accordingly, which was first performed

formed by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. From *that time* therefore he *expected* their *compliance* under those *Pains* to which their *new discovered Immortality* made them obnoxious.

The *Earliest Writers* suppose that God did at first *design* this *Immortality* for all *Adam's Posterity* (if he had *not fall'n*) by deriving this *immortal Spirit* to them. But whether he continued that design of making them *actually Immortal* since, is *not* so certain. The *Scripture* makes the *choice* of the *Peculium* perfectly *arbitrary*, which plainly supposes the *Favours* reserved for them *not* due to the *rest* of *Mankind*, on account of the *essential* Ingredients of their common *Humanity*. So it is described in the *choice* of the *Israelitish* Nation, rather than of any *other* Nation, to the *Privilege* of the *Peculium*; that it was *not* for any *advantages* themselves could pretend to *above* any *other* Nation; but because God was *pleased* to signalize them with those distinguishing *Favours*, for his *own* sake, and his *great Name* which was *called upon* *then*, by which he had *appropriated* them to his own *peculiar* Care; and on account of the *Promise* and *Covenant* he had been *pleased* to enter into with their *Patriarchal* Ancestors. Plainly supposing no such *Obligation* on account of their *descent* from *Adam*, the *common* Original of all other

29.

The Title to the Spirit, on account of the former Peculium; was perfectly arbitrary. So they who were not Proselyted into that Peculium seem to have been so long left to their natural Mortality.

tions. The same *liberty* is again asserted to God in his proceedings with the *Posterity* of the *first appropriating Patriarch*, *Abraham* himself. Even *his Posterity* were not *all* included in the *Peculium*, but only the descendants of *Isaac*, not of *Ishmael*. And even, in the *seed* of *Isaac*, *Jacob* alone was *loved*, and *Esau* *bated*, as being *postponed* to his *younger Brother*, in this *greatest* of *National Favours*. For all these passages are not to be understood of the *Persons* of these *Patriarchs*, but of the *Nations* who could pretend to them as their *Partriarchal Ancestors*. And I know not what can be clearer to this purpose than the *opposition* insisted on by *S. Paul*, between the *first* and *second Adam*, between *Adam* our *Progenitor* and our *Blessed Saviour*: That in *Adam* all die, and that it must be from our *Saviour* the *second Adam* that all must derive their title to the *Life*, that is *opposed* to the *Death*, derived from the *former earthly Adam*. We are said to be in *Adam* whilst we have nothing but what we derive from *him*, as *essential* to our *Constitution*. And what that is, the same *Apostle* shews, when he calls it the $\psiυχὴ ζῶσα$, in opposition to the $\piνεῦμα ζωοποιόν$. The latter he makes only derivable from *Christ* as being the same with the *Image* of the *second Man*, the *Lord from Heaven*, Λόγος , as the $\psiυχὴ$ is the *Image* of that *Earthly Adam*

Adam, from whom we receive all our properly *Human Nature*. This *πνεῦμα* is that alone which he acknowledges as a *Principle of Immortality*; that *Immortality*, at least, which can *Immortalize* our Happiness. And so far also of *Immortal Punishment* as none are *actually immortaliz'd* by God to *Punishment*, beyond the *Principles* of their *Human Nature*, but they who had it in their *Power* to have been *Pneumatical*, if themselves had *pleased*. This *Spirit* is the *Spirit of Christ*, and is given by him alone in his *Baptism*, according to the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*. This *Baptism* admits us into *one Body* with *Him*, which *Body* is his *Church*. The same *Baptism* is the *Laver of Regeneration*, and the *renewal of the Holy Ghost*. This therefore alone entitles us to be *in Christ*. So *S. Paul*, no doubt, understood it when he speaks of those who had been *in Christ* before himself. His meaning was, That they had prevented him in their *initiation* into the *Church* by *Baptism*. Such are *in him*, as *Members* of his *Mystical Body* are said to be *in the Body* into which they are *incorporated*, as the *Branches* are said to be *in him* as the *Mystical Vine*. But principally as being *one Spirit* with *him*; and, as on *that* account, the *Scripture* owns that form of *speaking*, that *Persons* so *spiritually united* to him, are said to be *in the Spirit*, and to be *in the Λόγος* as well

well as the *Λόγος* in them. But the *ψυχή* derived from *Adam*, as his *εἰκὼν*, includes also the *ἡλικία* *ζώνη*, the *status* in *Tertullian*, which is given to *all Nations*, according to the forementioned passage of *Isaiah*, and the *Mystical* Interpretation of it received by the *Christians* from the *Jews*, which does not of it self make us *Immortal* (according to the sense of the *first Christians*) but only *qualifies* us for *Immortality* by a *Union* with the *Spirit*, which alone can entitle us to *actual Immortality*. Though we have been without the *Spirit*, we are still in the *first Adam*, and bear his *Image* only, in whom we all die. Plainly therefore, by this *Scripture Hypothesis*, none can lay any claim to *Immortality* but on account of the *Divine Spirit* actually received; or of the *Divine arbitrary Pleasure* actually immortalizing them for *Punishment* who might have had the *Spirit* if they would have complied with the *Terms* on which they were to have received him. But the utmost extent of the *Mystical Body of Christ* (as it is described in the *New Testament*) extends no farther than the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* of the *Old Testament*. Those *Patriarchs* especially, with whom *God* was pleased to make the *Patriarchal Covenant* for themselves and their *Patriarchal Seed*. Such were *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and some few before them in an ascending Line. But those

those *Patriarchal Covenants* which entitled their *Posterity* to the *indefinite Favours* of the *Peculium*, were certainly *limited* to the *descendents* of those *Patriarchs*, in *opposition* to all *other* coæval *Patriarchal Heads* of *other Nations*. So God *himself* explains his *own design*, when he tells us that he had *not dealt so with any other Nation*. And the *Notion* of their being a *chosen Nation*, and a *Peculiar People*, implies the same. *Those Nations* therefore could lay no claim to the *Mystical Body* of *Christ*, till they were *admitted* into it by the *terms* of the *new Peculium*, and the *new Revelations* of the *Gospel*, which could not be till the *partition Wall* was *broken down* by the *Cross* of *Christ*, and therefore could *concern* none that lived *before* the *Incarnation*. From the *Time* therefore of the *first choice* of even the *old Peculium*, to the *breaking down* of the *partition Wall*, the *partition* must have *continued*, which made *all Nations*, *besides* the *Jews*, a *separate Body* from that which our *Blessed Lord* was pleased to take for his *own Mystical Body*. So long therefore they could not be *Members* of his *Body*, nor consequently could they be *in him*, whilst they were *not in his Church*, in the *largest Interpretation* of it. And not being *in him*, they could not be made *alive*. Not being *in him*, they must still remain *in the old Adam*, in whom they were *all to die*. Not being *in him*,

they could have no pretensions to his Spirit, which the *Apostle* admits for the only *Principle of Immortality*. They were still in the *old Olive*, which was *wild by Nature*. Nor could they partake of the *sap and fatness* of the *good Olive*, *πίζαν* and *ωιόνηα*, *Rom. xi. 17.* before their *ἐγχεσίσεσμός*, their *Inoculation* into it. Nor could they do so, before their *Incorporation* into the *Mystical Body of Christ* by *Baptism* in their own *Persons*, who could lay no claim to be admitted into it, on account of any *Covenant* made with their *Forefathers*. Nor are they invited into the *Church* with any *Encouragement* of being accepted till *Act. xiii.* So long therefore, by the *Doctrine*, even, of the great *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, the *Gentiles* are reckoned as in the *old* and *former Adam*, as bearing his *Image*, and as liable to that *actual Mortality*, which he perpetually owns as the necessary consequence of their being so. Nor had they hitherto any warning of their being preternaturally immortalized to *Punishment*, mention'd by *S. Paul*, *Act. xvii.* which might put them in fear of being concern'd in the great day of *Judgment*, on account of God's having recalled the *permission* formerly indulged to them of walking in their own ways. These things seem to certain by the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*, and the generally received *Sentiments* of the *Apostolical Age*; that I can see

see no reason to doubt but that the *rest* of *Mankind* (who could plead no Title to the *Old or New Peculium*, nor were ever qualified for being *received* into either, by contrivances of *Divine Providence*, not for want of any diligence of their own) were still left to the consequence of that *Mortality* which was *natural* to them.

Yet, as I know how much the *contrary* 30.

Opinion has prevailed, so I am aware what *Proofs of Scripture* have been pleaded in favour of that *Opinion*. The *Texts* that favour our *Blessed Saviour's Design of Universal Redemption*, have been *thought* thus far, at least, *conclusive*, as to prove all *Human Souls* secure from *actual*

The Universality of those, who are mentioned as concerned in the Revelations of the Gospel, does not necessarily include any more of the Gentiles than those who lived after the Preaching of the Gospel, and who had heard it preached to them.

Mortality, not only *genera singularum*, but *singulas generum*. But I know not how, even themselves can own this to be the sense of those places, consistently with their own *Principles*. What is here supposed to be derived from *Christ*, is *opposed* to what is derived from *Adam*, and the *living Soul* is here instanced as the *particular* derived from *Him*. Yet even this particular cannot be supposed derived from *Adam* according to the *present Opinion* received from *S. Augustine*, which makes it immediately created by *God*. That therefore this *Soul* is reckoned as derived from *Adam* can be

understood no otherwise than as the *Soul* is an Ingredient in the *Human Nature* as derived from *Him*, by *all* which we are said to *bear* his *Image*, as having all the same *natural* Ingredients in *us* as were in *Him* on account of the *Human Nature* which is common to us *both*, on account of an *univocal* Generation. If therefore *all* that we have common with *Adam* (no not even this *noblest* Ingredient of *all*) cannot *hinder* us from *dying* as we are in *Him*; it will follow that even *actual* *Immortality* cannot be derived from any thing that is *essential* to our common *Nature*. Plainly therefore, that *Image* of *God*, that *Man* from *Heaven*, which *S. Paul* ascribes to our Blessed *Lord*, is *preternatural* and *supernatural*, and not necessarily agreeing to *all* that agree in the same *Human Nature*. But the true design of such passages, is, to *disown* such a *Confinement* under the *New Peculium*, as had been formerly under the *Old*, to *one* certain *Nation*. And, on the contrary, to declare *all Nations* qualified for being received into the *new Peculium*, without any obligation to *quit* their received *National Characteristics*, or to *incorporate* themselves into any one *particular Nation*, as they were *obliged* to do *before*. Withal, this *Universality* extended to all *particular Persons* who came any way to the *Knowledge* of the *Gospel*, after it was *promulged*: that *God* did as sincerely

cerely *design*, and *desire*, the rewarding of every *individual* Person, who *qualified* himself for the *favour*, by *receiving* it, and by *joyning* himself in the *Communion* and *Society* of the *Authoriz'd* Preachers and Promulgers of it, as he *veraciously* intended the *Punishment* of them who were wanting to themselves in *not* receiving it, when sufficiently *proposed* to them, and who could *not* be prevailed on to *qualifie themselves* for *Eternal Rewards* by *threats* of *Eternal Punishments* in case they would not *qualifie themselves* for *Eternal Rewards*. These *Notions* of *Universality* are perfectly sufficient for the *design* of the *first* Propagators of the Gospel, to *oblige* all that *heard* them to *comply* with the *Terms* that were requisite to *entitle* them to the *Benefits* of the Gospel. This *design* did not any way *oblige* them to give their *Opinion* of *Predecessors* out of the *Old Peculium*, and before the *Terms* of the *New Peculium* were *settled* and *promulged*, with whom the *Preachers* of that *Age* had not any the least *concern*. Nor were they *concerned* in any of the *other* Disputes that were started in *that* *Age*. I have, on the contrary shewn, from the *Apostle's* own Words, That the Case of the *Gentiles*, then *living*, was judged *different* from the Case their *Ancestors*, even as to that *particular* instance, of their *Obligation* to *enter* into the *true Peculium*. How then can it be
gather-

gathered that the *Immortality*, which could only be expected from *Christ*, was ever intended for them who had never heard of *Christ*, nor of any *Obligation* incumbent on them to believe on *Him*, nor any hopes of being accepted by *Him*?

31.
There is no
necessity,
that all
who dyed
in Adam
should be
immorta-
lized by
Christ.

The words indeed of the *Apostle* are express: That as in *Adam* all die, so in *Christ* all shall be made alive, 1 Cor. xv. 22. *Πάντες* is the word used in both parts of the Sentence. But it may easily be referred to *Adam* and to *Christ*, and, being so referred, that will not prove the event, but only the condition of *Men*, so long only as they are in *Adam*, and as they are in *Christ*. So the obvious meaning would be: That, as all who are in *Adam* die, so all who are in *Christ* shall be made alive. This may be very true, and is so by the Principles now mentioned. But it does not therefore any way imply, that all who were in *Adam* shall ever be in *Christ*, or shall therefore receive from *Christ* the Privilege of *Immortality*; which none can have who does not receive it from him. And, in truth, the concern of the Dispute was not, whether all *Men* simply, but whether they who were in *Christ*, should rise? This appears from the Objection of the *Hereticks*, who raised the Dispute, as we have it represented by the *Apostle* himself, their pretence was, That the Resurrection was past already, 2 Tim. ii. 18.

No

No doubt, on account of the *Baptismal Symbol* of rising out of the *Water*, by which our rising with *Christ* is both signified and stipulated. This *Resurrection* they understood of dying to *Sin*, and rising to *Righteousness*, as the *Apostle himself* does also elsewhere understand it, yet not so as to exclude the *Resurrection* of the *Body* also. But the *Hereticks* seem to have taken this advantage from that *Concession*: That, because that *Mystical Resurrection* from *Sin*, was transacted in the *Soul*, there was therefore no need of extending the *Promise* signified by that *Symbol*, on *God's* part, further, of another, and a distinct, *Resurrection* of the *Body* also. This stating of the *Question* the *Apostle* also supposes in his *Reasonings* against these *Hereticks*. He also *Reasons* from *Baptism*, 1 Cor. xv. 29. Observing that the principal design of *Baptism* was purposely to assure us of that *Article*, of the *Resurrection* of the *Bodies* which was then received with the greatest difficulty. So that he reckons the denial of that as an evacuation of our whole *Baptism*, as that which would make the profession of *Faith* required from *Catechumens*, as a qualification for their *Baptism*, useless; and the remission of *Sins*, which a *valid Baptism* was designed to expiate, also null, if the *Body* was to receive no benefit from the *Baptism*. That is the importance of his words: Tour
Faith

Faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins, v. 17. This would, in the consequence, overthrow their own Notion of a *Resurrection from Sin*, if their *Baptism* had been *unavailable* for their *Expiation*. But the *Principle* on which this *Reasoning* proceeds, is, that the great design of *Baptism* is to make us *one* with *Christ*, as well *Bodily* as *Spiritually*. So it is, that we are said to be *Baptized into one Body*, 1 Cor. xii. 13. That is, by the *Baptism* of *Water*, as well as we are *Baptized into one Spirit*, by the *superiour* part of the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*. And indeed we are *qualified* for our *Union* with *Christ* in the *Spirit*, by our being first made *one Body* with *Him*. So that this *lower Baptism* is *fundamental* to the other. And our *Union* in *Spirit* must fail, if we be not first made *one Body* with our *Lord*, which will *ruine* the *Union* pretended by these *Hereticks*, in case this *Bodily Union* should fail, which is so *fundamental* to all this *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*. This therefore being supposed that we are made *one Mystical Body* with *Christ* in our *Baptism*: it will follow further, that our *Bodies* are to be *invested* with all the *Privileges* of his *Body*. This must be understood as *Covenanted* on *Christ's* part when we consider these *Baptismal Symbols*, not only as *Signifying* but as *Covenanting Symbols*, for performance on *Christ's* part of what is *signified*, and therefore *covenanted* on

his Part. But the *Resurrection* of our Lord could be no *Mystical Resurrection* from Sin, because *He knew no sin*. It could therefore only concern his *Body*, and his *Soul* no otherwise than *consequently*, as it was concerned in the Events of his *Body*. However it was not even his $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, but his $\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$, which is supposed, in this Reasoning of the *Apostle*, as the Principle of *Immortality*. As for the *Resurrection* of our Saviour's own *Body*, that he lays down as a *Foundation* of his whole *Preaching*, and of his whole *Apostolical Office*, which was to be an *Authentical Witness* of the most memorable *Acts* of our Saviour, but particularly of his *Resurrection*, as has already been observed by others. So he, v. 14, 15. Hence therefore he gathers further, That if *Christ's Body* was raised, our *Bodies*, must be raised also. Which Reasoning depends on this *Act* of *Christ* in *Baptism*, whereby he is pleased in that *Sacrament* to accept and receive our *vile Bodies* into a *Mystical Union* with his own *Body*, so as to oblige himself to treat them as if they had been indeed his own *Body*; and not to think any fruition of *Privilege* to his own *Body* complete, unless it be communicated to all others also, whom he has been pleased to admit to this honour of being accounted as his own *Members*. So he Reasons elsewhere, concerning the *Members* of this same
Mysti-

Mystical Body. That the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it: or one member be honoured, all the members rejoyce with it. 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. So the Reasoning holds in relation to the Concern particular Members ought in Reason to have for all the fellow-members of their common Body. Which must certainly proceed more strongly concerning the Head, whose Concern for observing the exact Rules of Reason and the Publick Good, must infinitely exceed that of any purely Human Members. But there is another Topick of Reasoning allowed in this Body, whereby a Possession of any Member of it, as representing the whole, is judged in Law sufficient to convey a Legal Right to all the other Members of the same Body, as being indeed judged a Legal Possession of all the other Members by such their Proxy, though they do not as yet enjoy the fruits of such their Legal Title. The same way as the Earnest Penny in possession, conveys a Legal Title to all the remainder of the agreed Price. So we are said to be already set down in Heavenly places, Eph. ii. 16. because our Brethren of the Church Triumphant are already in possession of Heaven it self. So the Apostle Reasons from our Saviour's Resurrection to ours, as he is the first fruits from the dead, v. 23. As the Consecration of the first fruits was judged

judged in *Law* to extend to the whole *Harvest*. And as he is the *first begotten from the dead*. The *Consecration* of the *First-born* consecrated the whole *Families*. And the *Consecration* of the *Levites*, in lieu of the *First-born*, was a *Consecration* of the whole *Israelitish Body*. Thus *Baptism* was $\iota\pi\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\omega\iota$, v. 29. as it gave them a security for the *Resurrection* of their dead *Carcasses*. They are elsewhere frequently, in this *Dispute*, called $\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\omega\iota$ simply without an *Article*. Nor does the *Article* add any new *Emphasis*, as some conceive ; $\delta\ \nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\omega\iota$ does also signify a dead *Carcase*, though of a *Woman*, as in the Cases of *Lucretia* and *Virginia*. But all this *Reasoning*, grounded on our *Baptism*, can only concern those who are admitted to the honour of *Baptism*. The *Consequences* are only concerning such, That if *Christ* be risen, they must rise also ; and that if they do not rise, neither can it be true that he is risen. For they only are his *Members*, and they only are the *Harvest* of which he is the *First-fruits*, nor are any other of the *Family* of which he is the *First-born*. Nor is it pertinent to this purpose to include any of the rest of *Mankind*, barely on that general account alone of their having born the $\epsilon\iota\chi\omega\iota$ of the first *Adam*. But it is very pertinent to the same purpose to include the generality of those who are in *Christ* by *Baptism*, lest otherwise the
He-

Hereticks might put it off as a *singular Case*, that the *Body of Christ* had been raised, as if none *besides* were concerned in it. And withal, that every *Individual Baptized*, professed *Christian* might, from this general inference, be assured of the *Resurrection* of his *own Body*. This therefore I take for the true sence of this place, which does not any way imply, that *all*, who ever were in *Adam*, shall be *immortaliz'd* by *Christ*, without *whom* there can be no hopes of *actual Immortality*.

32.
The Apo-
stle inti-
mates,
that, in the
space be-
tween A-
dam and
Moses,
they, who
had not the
Spirit,
were left
to their
actual
Mortali-
ty.

This sence also is confirmed by the like Expressions in the parallel place of *Rom. v.* There the *numbers* concerned in the *Death*, introduced by *Adam*, or the *Immortality* introduc'd by *Christ*, are said to be πολλοί, that is, of those who are concerned in the event of *actual Death* or *actual Immortality*. So through the offence of one Many are said to be dead; and the grace of God, and the gift of Grace by one Man *Jesus Christ*, to have abounded unto Many, *v. 15.* And, As by one Man's Disobedience Many were made sinners: so by the Obedience of one shall Many be made Righteous, *v. 19.* And that *all men* are not included, appears from *v. 14.* where the βασιλεία of *Death* is confin'd to the space between *Adam* and *Moses*. As *Adam* was the first by whose sin *Death* descended on his *Posterity*, without any sin of their own, but as they that sinned in him, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρ-

ἡμαρτον, v. 12. They are said *not to have sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.* That is, not against a *Law* given to them as the *Law* concerning the forbid-Fruit was given to *Adam*, to be observed by *Adam*, not by his *Posterity*. The first *Law* given the *Peculium* to be observed by them in their *own* Persons, he reckons to have been that of *Moses*, which therefore he makes to have been the *first Epocha*, from whence a breach of *Law*, which might be judged *criminal* in them, was to be dated. So he reasons: *Sin is not imputed where there is no Law*, v. 13. That is, where the *Law*, against which the *Sin* is committed, is not in the *power* of the *Sinner*, whether he will keep or observe it. The *Reasoning* is the same as before: *where no Law is there is no transgression*, Rom. iv. 15. And the *design* seems to be, to make out this βασιλεία of *David*, mention'd on the same occasion. It alludes, if I mistake not, to the αὐτοκρατορία, *Wisd. i. 14.* another *Hellenistical* Author, about the same Age. Whether the *Apostle* derived the *form* of *speaking* from that place I cannot say. However that place alone is sufficient to shew that this form of *Speech* was *familiar* among such as the *Apostle* himself was, *before* his *Conversion*. Now by βασιλεία here, that *Lawful* form of *Monarchy* cannot be understood (which is opposed to *Tyranny*) as li-

mitted by Confederations of Equity and Conscience; but rather that very form which is by those called Tyranny, in regard of its Arbitrariness, though not of its Usurpation. This βασιλεία therefore of Death, thus explain'd, implies such a Power of him who has the power of Death, Ebr. ii. 14. as is unavoidable by him who is obnoxious to the sentence of Death, by any means in the power of the Patient. That is the Case of those who suffer by a Law violated not by themselves, but by another, who has a power of concluding them so far, at least, by his own Acts, as to involve them in a participation of the Punishment, however otherwise innocent in their own Persons. So it was in the Case of Acham's Children, and the first Child of King David by Bathsheba, and the Posterity of Saul, who were punished by the command of God himself for the sins of their Ancestors, to which they could not possibly have been accessory, by any Contribution of their own. The Reason therefore of their sufferings, was entirely derived from their being contained in their Ancestors, by the most antient Patriarchal Right, received then as a Jus Gentium, by the Civiliz'd Nations. And probably not without a Divine Positive Constitution, though too antient to be proved so, as being far more antient than the Invention of Letters, which were the only means by which

which it was possible that the *History* of the *Legislation* it self, could have been conveyed to *Posterity*. However it is most certain that the thing it self was thought *just*, because *God* himself required it, who deals with *Men* by the same Rules of *Equity* by which they regulate their dealings with each other, and therefore appeals even to themselves as *Judges* of the *Equity* of his own dealings with them. This therefore our great Apostle supposes to be the Case of the *Death* inflicted on *Adam's* *Posterity*, within the *space* now mentioned, before the Promulgation of the *Mosaic Law*, for a *Transgression* of a Command imposed on *Adam's* Person, which was no otherwise imputable to them than as they were, by this Rule of *Patriarchal Covenants*, included in him, and, on that account, chargeable with the *Sin* of the *Transgression* of a *Personal Command*: ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμολογῶντι ἡμαρτίαν. But the Case was otherwise afterwards, when that *Law* was given, which was intended to be observed by every Individual Person of the *Posterities* concerned, as well as by their *Patriarchal Ancestors*. Here it was in the power of every Individual, by the use of his own *Free-will*, to entitle himself, as well to the *Rewards* of the *Observation*, as to the *Punishments* of the *Violation*, of that same *Law*. This Case therefore was the same with that of *Adam* himself, wherein

the *Power of Death* was not so *Absolute* and *Regal*, when it was in the *Power* of each *Free will* to exert it self from the *Power* of the *captivating Tyrant*. Not so when the *Fate* of the *whole Posterity* was to be determined by one *single Act* of the *Patriarchal Ancestor*, which, if it were an *evil one*, exposed them all to *Punishment*, whether they would, or no. Here therefore was no *avoiding* the *Punishment* so incurred. These therefore could have no *hopes* of *Immortality* by this *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, as being wholly *determined* by the *single Act* of *Adam*. This Case continued from *Adam* to *Moses* in the *Posterity* of *Cain* and *Ham*, notwithstanding the different Case of *Setb* and some other particular *Patriarchs*. And the *Law* given by *Moses* was the *first Act* of *Divine Legislation*, as ever a *Peculium*, after that given to *Adam*, that is mention'd in the *Scripture*, wherein *Life* as well as *Death* are propos'd as *Obligations* to the *Duty* required by it, and which might therefore put them in *hopes* of that *actual Immortality*, which only exceeded the power of their *Nature*, as a *Reward* of their *free Obedience*. Before, this very *Reasoning* of the *Apostle* seems to imply, that the greatest numbers of those who lived within that Period, were left to the consequence of their *natural Mortality*, in being abandon'd to the uncontrollable *Power of Death*,

as a *King*. This therefore is a clear conviction that the *universal* Clause, used in the same Chapter, in the same Case, ought not so to be understood, as to contradict this plain *Doctrine* of the Apostle: nor indeed does it any way seem *inconsistent* if fairly understood. The words are these: *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of Life, v. 18.* It is most certain, that all Individual Men have not the benefit of actual Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, in the same latitude of signification wherein the word is taken when they are said to be liable to the condemnatory sentence of Death for the Sin of Adam. It is therefore much more agreeable to the Apostle's design, to understand the *Universality* in the sense now explain'd, of those who accept of the Gospel upon their hearing it preached. So that the *Parity* refers rather to the Case, than to the equal *Universality* of the Persons concerned in it. Such *Universal* Particles are to be limited according to the exigency of the Subject in the Scripture. So the Apostle concerning the day of Judgment, *Then shall every man have praise of God, 1 Cor. iv. 5.* His meaning is not, That every Man shall have praise of God, who shall then appear before that most exact and impartial Tribunal; but,

The Distinction between

That every Man shall have it, whose Cause shall then be judged to deserve it. And it is usual, even in ordinary Conversation, not to mention such limitations as every Person concern'd would have judged unnecessary to the design of the Speaker, that is, in such Cases wherein he had otherwise so plainly signified his Mind, as that he could not mean his words in the unlimited sense, if he would speak consistently.

33.
The Light
that en-
lightens
every Man
that com-
eth into
the world
is the *Πνοή*
not the
Πνεύμα.

There is another Text, which may be thought favourable to prove that the Spirit is given to every particular by Christ himself. Which, if this be the true meaning of it, will prove that all are actually immortalized, and must therefore be concerned in the general Judgment. It is this, That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, S. Joh. i. 9. They are spoken of the *Λόγος*, and therefore of our Blessed Saviour, as to his Divine Person, as he is that second Adam, and the Lord from Heaven. So it is, that he is concerned in this additional perfection of our Human Nature. This Light is the same with the Principle of the new Life, which is that which is naturally immortal. So the Evangelist's former words imply: In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men, v. 4. If therefore this Light was given to all men, the mystical Life must, at the same time, (by this Reasoning) be supposed to have been

been given them also. What then can hinder their being *actually Immortal*? Nothing indeed could do it, if the Gift here spoken of, as derived from the *Logos* to all men, had been the same with that *Divine Spirit*, which the *Scripture Reasoning* supposes as the *Principle of Immortality*, as the *Quakers* fanſie. But it is ſo certain, from the *Current* of the *New Testament*, that all Men have not that Spirit; that this is alone ſufficient to aſſure us that ſuch a ſence as that is, could not have been intended by the *Holy Ghost* in this place. *Moses*, wiſhing that *God's People* were all *Prophets*, plainly ſuppoſes that all *God's People*, even of that *Peculium*, had not the Spirit. Accordingly it is ſuppoſed, as the *Privilege* of the *New Peculium*, that they ſhould be all taught of *God*, in regard of this *Unction* of the Spirit which was to teach them all things, this *Wiſdom*, which in all Ages entering into holy Souls, made them friends of *God* and *Prophets*, *Wiſd.* vii. 27. So the *Evangelist* tells us, That the Spirit was not yet given before our Lord was glorified. And the *Apoſtles* that it was at his *Ascenſion* that he gave gifts unto men, meaning theſe gifts of the Spirit. And that they had received it not by the Law, but by the *Obedience of Faith*. So the *New Testament* takes it for a *Prerogative* of our *Saviour's Baptiſm* to give the Spirit. At leaſt, as to that general Union of our Lord's

Disciples in the same Spirit, so as that who ever had not the Spirit of Christ, should, for that very reason, be concluded to be none of his. And the pretended Gnosticks are said to be Pſychical, not having the Spirit. And all that were out of the Orthodox Communion are therefore, through S. John's first Epistle, supposed to be in darkness, and liable to all the dismal Consequences of being so. So far it is from being possible, by Scripture Principles, and his own Doctrine so clearly expressed elsewhere, that the same S. John could mean that every man, who comes into this world, should have this Light of the immortalizing Spirit. His meaning therefore cannot be of the πνεῦμα, but the πρὸν ζῶνς, which was not taken for a Principle of actual Immortality, but only as a qualification for it, which might put Man in that middle station of indifferency between Mortality and Immortality, to be determin'd by the Event of his own Free-will. This is common to every man that cometh into the world. And therefore this it is, which our Apostle makes in all men, inlightned by the visitation of the Λόγος, as an external Principle. Yet so as not to make any change in the Nature, in the Person so inlightned, without peculiar Divine Favour, and dispositions in the recipient, for such a Union with the Λόγος, as may qualifie it for the Divine Favour of raising it above its own Nature.

Till

Till then, they are separable again, and this external Visitation of the Λόγος leaves the visited ψυχή as Mortal as it found it, where there is no particular design of God for immortalizing it to Punishment. So the Apostle himself explains his own meaning: *The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not, v. 5.* And so Tatian Orat. cont. Græc. concerning this Human Soul: καὶ ἐαυτὴν σκοτός ἐστίν, καὶ ἐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωταίνον, καὶ τὸ ἐστὶν ἅρα τὸ εἰρημνόν· ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς ἐκαταλαμβάνει. The Soul still remains in Darkness as it was, where there is no κατάληψις, by which the Soul may lay hold on the Light, and unite it self with it, so as to receive the benefit of the Illumination, and to be actually illuminated by it. Till then, it cannot, by these Principles, have any Title to the regions of Light and Immortality. Tatian goes further for clearing the meaning of these Principles of the Evangelist. He denies this κατάληψις which must cause the Union to be in the power of the dark Soul, but makes it necessary that the πνεῦμα have a κατάληψις of the Soul, in order to the actual immortalizing it. So he goes on: ψυχή γὰρ ἐκ αὐτῆς τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸ φῶς τὴν σκοτίαν κατήλαθεν, ὁ λόγος μὴ ἐστὶ τὸ τῷ θεῷ φῶς· σκοτός δ' ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχή. Διὰ τὸτο μόνη μὴ διαίτῳμένη, πρὸς τὴν ὕλην νεύει κάτω συνάποθνήσκουσα τῇ σαρκί· συζυγίαν δ' κεκτήμενη τὴν τῷ θεῷ πνεύ-

πνεύματι. ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀλόγιον, ἀντιθέσει δὲ τοῦ
 ἀπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐδύνην χωρεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα. No
 doubt he perfectly understood the impor-
 tance of these terms among the *Platonists*,
 from whom the *Evangelist* borrowed them;
 and therefore, in this matter, is a fair In-
 terpreter of what the *Holy Ghost* was pleased,
 in using them, to confirm with his own Di-
 vine Revelation. The rather, because the
 Scripture itself agrees so exactly with him
 in the Consequences of what he delivers
 here. The Scripture also ascribes the ἐν-
 ληψις to the Λόγῳ, not to the Human
 Soul. That very word S. Chrysostome ren-
 ders by κατέλαλης, as being of the same sig-
 nification. The Scripture also owns the συ-
 ζυγία, the Spiritual Marriage, between
 Christ and the Soul, as Tatian does also be-
 tween the Soul and the Spirit. Christ is
 the same way the Head of the Man, as the
 Man is of the Woman. Here therefore is no
 Mystical Marriage, no Arrba of the Spirit,
 which may entitle to the remainder at the
 Resurrection. The Ptolemaic Gnosticks also
 in Irenæus, have the same Notions of the
 Invisibility of their Spiritual Seed from their
 fallen Aeon to those of the Psychological Nature,
 notwithstanding the glimpses externally
 given them. Yet they did not think such
 glimpses so received, sufficient to improve
 those Psychological Beings, to any excellency
 exceeding their own Nature. This Reasoning
 there-

Hebr. ii.
 16.

therefore is very agreeable to the *Platonick* terms, understood as the *Platonists* themselves, whose terms they were, did usually understand them. And that the Language of *S. John* in this beginning of his Gospel is *Platonical*, *S. Augustine* owns, not only from his own observation, but from the acknowledgment of the *Platonists* themselves. *Amelius* also a professed *Platonist* owns it, whose words we have preserved by *Ensebius*. Which being granted, it must be also agreeable to the sense of the *Holy Ghost* himself, as he has been pleas'd to express his own sense in these then known *technical* terms of the *Platonists*. This I have proved professedly in my *Prolegomena* to my honoured Tutor's Book *de Obstinatione*. Our modern *Enthusiasts* therefore are very much mistaken, when they hence prove all Men to have the *Spirit* so as to be actually illuminated by him. No union of *Spirit* and *Soul* without a $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$. No $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$ successful for $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$ from this *World*, but that whereby the *Spirit* lays hold on the *Soul*, which cannot be expected where the darkened *Soul* has no $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$ of its own. The want of this, leaves such a *Soul* in its former darkness, and disability to mount into the regions of *Light* and *Immortality*. This preventing $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$ of the *Spirit* without which that of the *Soul* is insignificant, may probably be the preventing Grace of the *Spirit*,

rit, asserted by the *Catholick Church*, in opposition to the *Pelagians*. And the denying it arbitrarily was then more reconcilable with the *Divine Goodness*, when the want of it did not expose the *Soul*, to which it was denied, to *Eternal Torments*; whilst God was pleased not to oblige them to lay hold on this preventing *Illumination* under any penalty for neglecting it, but only by the prospect of promoting their own greatest *Interest*.

34.
The dead
in Christ
who are to
rise first,
are not op-
posed to the
dead out
of Christ,
but to those
who con-
tinue not
in him till
their
death.

There are also other *Texts*, which may be thought favourable to this general concern of all *Mankind* in the *Resurrection*. The *dead in Christ* are said to rise first, 1 *Thess. iv. 16*. But that does not necessarily imply that they shall rise at all who never heard of *Christ*. The *dead in Christ*, are they who are actually received into *Christ's Mystical Body*; and not only so, but who have continued in the *Mystical Body* to their *Lives end*, so as to die in it. For it is the *Resurrection to Happiness* that is here spoken of; not a *Resurrection simply*, as indifferent to *Happiness* or *Misery*. So it appears from that parallel Text; *Blessed are they who die in the Lord*, *Rev. xiv. 13*. The *dead in Christ*, are the same with those who die in the *Lord*. And the *Resurrection* spoken of, is only such a one as makes the Persons concerned in it *Blessed*. So it appears also in another place, where mention is made of this

this *first Resurrection*: Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first Resurrection*: on such the *second death* shall have no power, Rev. xx. 6. And this is the *Resurrection* which is usually meant in the *Sacred Writers*, when the word is mentioned simply. The *Resurrection to Misery*, is thought as little to deserve the name of a *new Life*, as of a *Resurrection*. It is therefore called a *second Death*, when *Life* is restored for no other end but to qualify the Person for an *Eternal Punishment*, for which his own Nature had *not* qualified him. This Text therefore gives *no* account of them who are concerned in the *Resurrection to Punishment*: Those who had been formerly in *Christ*, though they did not *die* in him; and those who *might* have been in him, if themselves had pleased, though they never were in him *actually*. These are sufficient for the *second Resurrection*, though all out of the *true Peculium*, who had never heard of our Blessed Saviour, should *never* be concerned in it at all.

But the same *Apostle* tells us, that, As 35.
 many as have sinned without Law, shall also
 perish without Law: and as many as have sin-
 ned in the Law, shall be judged by the Law;
 Rom. ii. 12. Here some Advantage may cer-
 tainly be taken from the *Variation* of the
 the *Apostle* to perish, rather than to be concerned in the Judgment relating
 to the Breakers of the Law.

They who
 knew of
 no Divine
 Law by
 which they
 were to be
 judged, are
 supposed by

Phrase:

Phrase : that which is called *perishing* in the former part of the Verse, is opposed to being *judged* in the latter : And that the *perishing* here mentioned, may as well be be understood of a *ceasing to be*, as of any *positive* Inflictions ; and that it looks as if it were *designed* to intimate a *Diversity* in the two Cases, that the *Phrase* is so industriously altered. The Words may indeed bear that Design, yet there may be another Reason of the Change. *Judgment*, properly so called, seems to relate to a Tryal by a *Law*, and it was taken for one of the Privileges of the *Jews*, that *God* had given them a *fiery Law*, *Deut. xxxiii. 2.* wherein the *Heathens* could not rival them. Yet even the *Sins* of the *Gentiles* must suppose a *Law* violated by them, as every Sin is *ἀνομία*, though that *Law* was not *promulged* out of the midst of the *Fire*, like that of *Moses*. The same *Law* reached the *Gentiles* also so far, as the Parity of *Reason* reached the Case of the *Gentiles*. And the *Promulgation* was sufficient, where the *Equity* of the *Law* was *acknowledg'd* even by them. In this case, the *Apostle's Reasoning* holds, that *having not the Law* [that is, of the *Jews*] *they are a Law unto themselves*, v. 14. So that in this Regard also, *God's Punishment* of the *Heathens* may also be called a *Judgment*. And that it was so *intended*, seems very probable from

from v. 5. where the Judgment of the Jews is said to be *in the Day of Wrath, and Revelation of the righteous Judgment of God, v. 5.* That Day is the Day of Judgment, as appears from v. 16. *in the Day when God shall judge the Secrets of Men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel.* These Words are separated from the Words objected only by a Parenthesis, and are therefore committed immediately with the Case of the Jews. If therefore the time when the Gentiles, who have sinned without the Law, shall perish without the Law, be the same with that wherein the Jews are to be judged by the Law; both Procedures must be referred to the Day of the general Judgment. And, though the Word *perish* may bear that milder Sense of only ceasing to be, yet it is also used, in the Scriptures, concerning them whom all must believe liable to the severest positive Inflictions. Judas himself is called *ὁὸς ἀπωλείας*, S. Joh. xvii. 12. Yet of this Case our Saviour himself assures us, that it had been good for him if he had not been born, S. Matth. xxv. 24. S. Mark xiv. 21. which could not have been true, if his Punishment had been no more than a discontinuance of that being received at his Birth. So concerning the Vengeance inflicted on them who obey not the Gospel: who shall be punished with everlasting Destruction from the Presence of the Lord, and from

from the Glory of his Power, 2 Thess. i. 9. ὁλεθρον αἰώνιον is the Word. So concerning those who *denied the Lord that bought them*, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν. 2 S. Pet. ii. 1. The Word therefore will indeed bear a larger Signification. Yet, in *this place*, *Annihilation* may perhaps, be more *natural*. So it will be best *opposed* to the case of being *judged*, as the *Jews* must be. And so it will best answer their State of being ἄνομοι, *without Law*, as the same Apostle himself expresses it. Their being a *Law to themselves*, as *owning the Reasonableness* of the *things impos'd as a Law by God on the Jews*, but not on *themselves*, would no farther oblige *them* to the *Observation* of them, than as their *own Interests* might *prevail* with them to observe them, as they would avoid the *Punishments*, and obtain the *Rewards* of Providence in *this Life*; and as they would avoid the ill *Consequences* of *not* observing them, and enjoy those *Benefits* which were *naturally consequent* to their *Observation*. But this would not make them liable to the *Judgment*, as it was to award *Rewards* and *Punishments* for the *future*. That any such *future Rewards* or *Punishments* were to be, was a *new Revelation* of the *Gospel*, and particularly of the *Gospel preach'd* by S. Paul himself, v. 16. as I have now observed from *Acts xvii. 31*. But there are

two Uses of that Day: the former, not properly *Judicial*, but to give an account of the *Justice of Providence* in all its past Dispensations, by bringing every secret thing to light. That Use of a general Appearance, is intimated in the *Revelations* of the *Old Testament*, *Eccl. xii. 14.* For discovering the secret *Virtues* that had been rewarded in the *Prosperity of Sinners*, and the unknown *Wickednesses* which had been punished by the perpetual *Infelicities* of better-deserving Persons, and the many unknown ways of God for adjusting those seeming Incongruities to the Persons respectively concerned in them. This part of the Procedure of that Day, required the presence of all, as well as of the *Peculium*. Nor is there any Intimation that even *Mortal Souls* might not survive the *Body*. The *Vehicle* on which they depend, as it was more subtil than their grosser organized Bodies, so they were thought to continue long after the *Dissolution* of their Bodies, and to continue the Existence of the *Souls* that depend on them. These *Vehicles* are the *umbræ*, the εἰδωλα θανόντων, owned generally by the Antients from a consentient Tradition of which no Original is known, and therefore very probably from those *Divine Revelations*, which all Accounts of the earliest Nations believe familiar in the first Ages of Mankind. No other Original

is so likely of such *Traditions* wherein *Nations* were agreed before that mutual *Commerce*, and the *Art of Letters* by which they might *communicate* their *Inventions* to each other. However there can be little doubt but that the *Primitive Christians* were agreed in it. They believed *separate Souls* to have *visible Bodies*, of the same *Shape* with those wherein themselves lived formerly. Yet they believed *those Bodies* also *Mortal*, as being capable of *sensible Pain* by the *Corporeal Fire of Hell*. All *Possibility* was by them believed to be a *Tendency to Dissolution*, as I have already intimated. As therefore these *separate Souls* were capable of *sensible Pain* in the *Interval* between their *first Death* and the *final Judgment*, so they might be *dissolved* by that *more exquisite Fire*, which was to prevail in the last *Conflagration*. At last, so far as to deprive them of any *sensibility of Pain*, which they ascribed to a *Separation* of their *Parts*. And without *Sense* we can hardly frame any *Idea* of a *Rational Soul*: None certainly that can be capable of *Punishment*. That therefore the *Souls of wicked Christians* shall be *enabled* to endure *Eternal Burnings* without *Dissolution*, is, by these Principles, to be ascribed to the same *Almighty Power*, by which the three *Children* were preserved in the *Fiery Furnace*. Only what was then performed
in

in *Mercy*, will here be ascribed to a Design of inflicting a more *exquisite Punishment*. Yet the *grossness* even of these *separate Vehicles* (if we may call them so) was the Reason why even *Souls*, designed for *Happiness*; were thought *disabled* to ascend to *Heaven* till the *Day of Judgment*; and in the mean time were thought to need the *Prayers* of their *living Brethren* on *Earth*, whilst they continued in those *separate Receptacles*; whither *Evil Spirits* were permitted to have Access.

As therefore even these *actually-mortal* 36.
Souls were generally thought to *survive* yet they
 these *grosser Bodies*, so there is Reason to might prob-
 believe that they may reach the general bably per-
Conflagration. And indeed the *New Testa-* severe in
ment Revelations seem generally to suppose their Be-
 that they shall indeed reach it. How else ing till the
 could the *Men of Nineveh*, or the *Queen* day of the
 of *Sheba*, *rise up in Judgment* with the general
Generation which heard our Saviour's *Preach-* Judg-
ing, and *condemn it*; if they were not, at ment. The
 least, to *appear* before that same *Tribunal*, Punish-
 to which the *Despisers* of our Saviour's ment of
Preaching were responsible? How could the Sodo-
 our Lord pronounce the Cases of *Tyre* and mites not
Sidon, mentioned in the *Old Testament*, and in Hell
 those of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, as more *toler-* Fire.
able in the day of Judgment, than those of
Chorazin and *Bethsaida*, and *Capernaum*;
 where he *preached* and wrought his *Mira-*

cles, if those *Heathens* were not to appear at the day of Judgment? Nor is it easily intelligible, how the Case of those *Heathens* before the Gospel could be more intolerable at the day of Judgment, than the Case of those who had the Honour to hear our Saviour's *Preaching*, and to see his *Miracles*; if, besides the Vengeance, for which they were so famed in the History and Prophecies of the *Old Testament*, they had a new *Arrear* of Punishment to commence at the day of Judgment, that was to be *Eternal*, and suitable to the monstrous *Nature* of the Crimes for which they were to be inflicted. But the Case will be very easie, if their appearing at the day of Judgment, be with no Design of concerning them in the Judgment of the Day, but only in the *Retrospective* part of the Day, for vindicating the Divine *Providence*, in Relation to what had been transacted by it formerly. In this Regard, that most formidable Example of Divine Vengeance on the *Sodomites*, by *Fire* from *Heaven*, was not to be compared with the Punishment of the *meanest* Criminals under the *Evangelical* Dispensation, on account of this single Consideration alone, that the *Fire* of the *Sodomites* had an end, and proceeded no farther than that *Generation*; but the *Fire* prepared for *Evangelical* Criminals, is *Eternal*, and exercised on Subjects *extraordinarily* enabled to suffer it *eternally*.
But

But I know the excellent Dr. Hammond conceives the *Sodomites* themselves to be in *Hell*, and proves his Opinion from the Words of St. *Jude*, v. 7. where he affirms them to suffer the *Vengeance of Eternal Fire*. This he gathers, because the Participle *ὑπάρχοντα*, is in the *Present Tense*, which that great Person understands so, as if the *Sodomites* were then in *Hell* when S. *Jude* wrote that Epistle, and as if S. *Jude* reasoned from that *Supposition*, that they were so. But had he reasoned so, he could not have reason'd from any *Authority* of the *Old Testament*. That had mentioned nothing concerning them, but what was *past*; no *Fire* in relation to *them*, but that wherein they and the *Cities about them*, as well as the *Inhabitants*, had *perished*; no *Hell* revealed *there*, wherein any but *Devils* were concerned; no Revelation then that any *Men* should be concerned in *that Hell*, which was originally prepared *only* for the *Devil* and his *Angels*; nothing concerning the *Eternal Punishment* of them who were *there*; nothing particularly of the *Sodomites* being there, or *continuing* there to the *Times* of the *Apostles*. How then could S. *Jude* gather any such *Doctrine* from the *Revelations* of the *Old Testament*? or reason from it, as he does here, against them who were to be concluded by those *elder Authorities*? The *Stile* indeed of the

Old Testament Prophecies, is full of Allusions to the *Judgments of the last Day*, even when it foretels *Judgments* confessedly *Temporal*, and which were fulfilled long before the *Apostles Age*. The reviving of the *dry Bones* in *Ezekiel*, was performed in the *Return of the Jews from their Captivity*. The *Day of the Lord* in *Joel*, is by *S. Peter* interpreted of that very time when he Preached, though described with all those formidable *Circumstances* which cannot be literally applied to any but the *last and general Judgment*. And it is plain, that those *Dramatical Hyperbolical Expressions* in the *Prophecies of the Old Testament*, were not understood of any such *general Judgment* by the *Jews of the Apostles Age*. Had they been so, there had been no need of a *new Revelation* to the *Apostles* for this same Purpose, for satisfying their *Contemporaries* of the *Truth* of it. *S. Jude* therefore must have argued from his own *Authority*, and that of his *Fellow-Apostles*, if this had been his *Meaning*. Why then did he not add, *according to my Gospel*, as *S. Paul* does in the same Case, *Rom. ii. 16.* where he insists on this *Revelation of the New Testament*, concerning the *Day of Judgment*? But to what Purpose had he done so against these *Despisers of Dominions*, and *Blasphemers of Dignities*; these *Separators of themselves* as more excellent, than any other
then

then in being, not excepting the *Apostles* themselves? That is the Notion of *ἀποδιό-
εσις* *αἰώνος*, v. 19. as the *Pharisees* did,
who had that Name given to their Sect,
because they were also of the same Humour.
But there is no need, that I can see, why
we should have Recourse to that more vio-
lent Interpretation. The *αἰώνιον* *πῦρ*, is
very naturally applicable, by the Reasonings
of that Age, to the Fire from Heaven, by
which the Cities of Sodom and Gomorrah
were burnt, according to the Sacred Histo-
ry. So the Writers of the New Testament
and the Platonists reckon all the Invisible
Heavenly Archetypes, 2 Cor. iv. 18. the
things which are not seen, are eternal. So
our Mansions in Heaven are called Eter-
nal Tabernacles, in Allusion to the *σκηνὰι*
of the Israelites, in their Pilgrimage from
Egypt to Canaan, S. Luke xvi. 9. So the
Manna, the true Bread from Heaven, is that
which gives Life to the World, S. John vi.
32, 33. which was no otherwise true of the
Manna in the Wilderness, than as its de-
scending from Heaven, qualified it to be a
Type of the Heavenly Manna. Accordingly
the Life given by that Manna to the Israe-
lites, who were fed by it, could be no o-
ther but a Heavenly Life in Reversion, to
such as were qualified for it, because that
Generation, who were Partakers of it, did
notwithstanding generally perish in the

Wilderness. And therefore, on the same account, the *Fire of Sodom*, as descending from *Heaven*, might, by the same *Mystical Reasoning*, be stiled *Heavenly*, and therefore *Eternal*. Not only so: That same *Fire* might be a further *Type* of the *Fire of Hell*, in which all should be concerned, who should be guilty of the *like* Impieties, under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And that on that general Account, that all things, which beset those who lived in those earlier Ages, beset them as *typical Examples* to those upon whom the *Ends of the World* were to come, 1 Cor. x. 11. And this I take to be the true Design of S. Jude: That the *Fire from Heaven*, by which the *Sodomites* were punished, was a *predictive Symbol* of the *like Fire* reserved for the *Gnostick Hereticks* he speaks of, as guilty of the *like Immoralities*, under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And so were many other like *Examples* of those *first Ages*, which were confessedly *Temporal*, for that is a *general Rule*, in these *Reasonings*; that what was *Temporal* in the former *Legal Dispensation*, which was it self no more than *Temporal*, did signify and predict something answerable to it, under the Dispensation of the *everlasting Gospel*; but differing from it in that *Particular*, that the thing signified was, according to the *Nature of the Dispensation*, under which it was to take place, it self *eternal*.

nal also. So the *Fire* from *Heaven*, which destroyed the *Sodemit*es, though it self was *extinguished* with its *Fuel*; yet signified a *Fire* that should never be *extinguished*, that should punish the *Rebels* against the *Eternal* Dispensation. And that extraordinary Contrivance of *God* in sending it from *Heaven*, when he could, if he had pleased, have made use of *Fires* occasioned by *Humane* Neglects for the same Purpose: That, I say, imply'd, in this way of Reasoning, that it should have another *Fire* answering it, under the more noble Dispensation, that should be, like the Dispensation it self, *Eternal*; because a *Fire* from *Heaven* was like to be so interpreted. This Analogy holds the more exactly, because the *Fire* of *Hell* itself, which the new Revelation owns as *Eternal*, is also described, as being of the same *Cælestial* Original; not as breaking out from the Centre of the *Earth* itself, and its *subterraneous* *Volcanoes*, as Philosophers have fancied. So, *The Lord Jesus* shall be revealed from *Heaven*, with his mighty *Angels*, in flaming *Fire*, taking *Vengeance* on them that know not *God*, and that obey not the *Gospel* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, 2 *Thess.* i. 7, 8. Therefore *God* himself is so often called a *consuming Fire*, *Deut.* iv. 24. ix. 3. *Hebr.* xii. 29. in regard of the *Schéchinah*, which has the Nature of *Fire*, as well as of *Light*. So he is described:

A

A Fire shall devour before him, Ps. l. 3. This is that which so affrighten'd the Jews in the Delivery of the Law, and which makes it so impossible to see his Face and live. And seems to be alluded to by the Poets, when Semele is said to have been burnt by Jupiter, appearing to her in his native Glory. Therefore his Angels, the Satellites of his appearing Presence, are said also to be a flaming Fire, Ebr. i. 7. from Ps. civ. 4. This Fire therefore of the Majestical Presence, is by all represented as *Eternal*; and as the Original of that which shall destroy the World, and continue the Punishment of those who are adjudged to it, to all Eternity. And because the Fire which destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, is said to have come down from Heaven, their Punishment might very well be ascribed to this *Eternal Fire*. Yet it does not follow that, because the Fire, by which they were punished, was *Eternal*, therefore this Punishment must have been *Eternal* also. Rather, on the contrary, the *Eternals* of the Gospel being generally typified by *Temporal Symbols*; it will be more agreeable, that the Fire of Sodom, as a Type of Hell, should have been *Temporal* also. And so that Fire was indeed *Temporal*, as to the Execution inflicted by it on those two wicked Cities, which seems indeed only alluded to by S. Jude in his Epistle.

That

That will indeed appear to be the most probable way of understanding him, if we compare him with the parallel place of S. Peter. There the Punishment is said to be the turning the Cities into ashes, 2 S. Pet. ii. 6. And consequently no other Punishment of the Citizens than what was necessarily consequent to the destruction of their Cities, which had an end with the Cities themselves, and therefore could not reach the Age of the Apostles. It is added further: That they were made an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly. This also shews that the Punishment here spoken of, could not be meant of the Apostles Age. The Persons, to whom S. Jude applies his discourse, were his then contemporary Gnosticks. The Apostle therefore, and his Contemporaries, must live after this Punishment, which was designed as an example for them. Nor could that Punishment have been exemplary, if it had not been before them for whose Terror it was designed. No, nor unless it had been publicly notified before the Time of those who were in danger of following so pernicious an Example, and who were therefore to be deterred from following it by the exemplary Punishment of those who had shewn them so dangerous an Example. But how can we imagine this notification made, but by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which mention both the

Sin

37.

Nor could it be Hell Fire which S. Jude (in the Case of the Sodomites) calls eternal Fire.

Sin of the *Sodomites*, and their *Punishment* too: but have not one word of any further *Punishment* they were afterwards to suffer in the *days* of the *Apostles*. What was then could not be known but by a new *Divine Revelation*, which could have no influence on the senses of the Persons then living, but only on their *Faith*; and therefore could be no great *Terror* to those whom the *Apostle* himself supposes *unfaithful*. But the *Belief* of the *Old Testament* was already received and settled, even in these *Infidels* themselves, and confirmed by an *Education* in favour of it. Therefore he might securely *Reason* from, even against them, notwithstanding their *Infidelity*. And it is accordingly the custom of the *Writers* of the *New Testament*, as they suppose the *Old Testament* in general to be designed by *Providence*, for the *instruction* and *warning* of their own *Age*; so to ground the *Notification* of those *Old Testament Examples* on their being written, and the *warning* given by them on their being written long before the Persons who were to be instructed and warned by them; not on any *New Revelation* made to themselves, not discoverable in the *Letter* of the *Old Testament* it self. No not when they have to do with Persons better affected to their Authority than the *Gnosticks* concerned in this *Epistle*. So; *Whatsoever things were written aforetime,*
were

were written for our learning, Rom. xv. 4. *Περὶ γεράων* is the word in both places. So that all the use of such Scriptures is derived from their being written, and written before the Case that made the Instruction necessary. So again: *All these things hapned unto them for ensamples: and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come*, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11. So in this very Epistle of S. Jude, the Gnosticks are said to be *περὶ σεβασμμένοις εἰς τὸ τοῦ κεῖ-μα*, and that *πάσαι*, v. 4. In regard of the many antient *γεράων* mentioning the judgments of God inflicted on the like Offenders, then referred to the Case of the Gnosticks by the Catholicks. And even here concerning the Case of the Sodomites themselves: *περὶ κεῖνται δαῖγμα*, v. 7. Plainly referring to their being mentioned in the Text of the Old Testament, with this design of warning the Gnosticks of the Apostolical Age, not to follow their example, and of letting them see what they must expect, in case they did follow it. That is the notion of *κεῖνται* with *καὶ τὸ κεῖν* in Athenæus, that a word had been mentioned in some antient Writer. And accordingly *περὶ κεῖνται* implies its being mentioned in the Scriptures, before the Case of the Gnosticks, who were to be instructed by it. Exactly answering the Sodomites being made an *ὑπόδειγμα* in S. Peter. The only Argument pretended by that excel-

cellent Person, why S. Jude should mean a Punishment endured by the Sodomites when himself wrote, is, that the *Particle* by which it is expressed, is in the *present tense*: *αἰώνις δίκῃ ὑπέρχουσι*. But if he had more narrowly examin'd the place, he would have found those words to be the *Nominative Case* to the *Verb* *περὶχέινται*. That Observation would have let him see, That the *present tense* implied in the *Participle* did not relate to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, but that rather wherein the *Cities* of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah* were destroyed by *Fire* from *Heaven*. That *Age*, I mean, mentioned by the *Scripture*, wherein they did *μεγαλύνειν*, which that very word implies to have been *ancienter* than the *Age* of the *Apostles*. *Περὶχέινται ὑπέρχουσι* is indeed the same as *μεγύνεινται περὶ ὑπέρχουσι*, the *Preposition* being equally referred to either: That they were formerly mentioned in the *Scriptures*, as suffering the *Vengeance* of that *Eternal Fire* from *Heaven*; or that they had been mentioned in the same *Scriptures*, as having formerly suffered that same *Vengeance*. This will perfectly overthrow the *Inference* of that great and good Man. However, that *Temporary Fire*, which destroyed the *Cities* of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, might so far be called *Eternal* as really typifying an *Eternal Fire* that was, in the *later days*, to destroy not themselves, but the *Gnosticks*. Yet I
con-

confess we have a like Reasoning in the *Hellenistical Book of Wisdom*, which makes the *Egyptian darkness* an image of that darkness which they should afterwards receive, not like the *Rebels* against the Dispensation of the *Gospel*, but the *Egyptians* themselves, *Wisd. xvii. 21*. Yet even that is very well accountable by our present *Hypothesis*. I see no reason why the *Sodomites* might not, as well as the *Egyptians*, endure the Sufferings of the *future eternal State*, during the time of their *Duration*. That is, from the time of their *Death* to the day of *Judgment*. But I know no *Scriptures* that can be produced to prove, either that they shall suffer the Pains of the *future state* in their *Bodies*; or that they shall suffer them, even in their *Souls* for ever.

Thus far therefore I have shewn, That 38.
 the *Immortalizing Principle* neither was, nor was *believed* in the *earliest* and *purest* Ages, any *Ingredient* in the *nature* of the *Human Soul* as *such*, so as that all *Mankind* might, on this account, be qualified to claim it as part of their *dues*, as *Men*. Yet I deny not, but that the *Human Soul*, as *πνὴ* or *flatus*, was thought to be from *God*; And as it was thought to be from *God*, it was *designed* by him to qualify all that had it for that *preternatural State* of *Immortality* and *Happiness*, for which he had honoured the whole *Kind* with so *noble* an *Original*. *S. Paul* quotes

The *πνὴ* which is in all men, (though it be of a *Divine Original*, yet) does not make us actually *Immortal*, but only disposes us for a *Union* with the *Spirit*.

quotes the saying of the Heathen Poet *Aratus* with approbation: Τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή, *Act. xvii. 28, 29.* And he *Reasons* on it, as granting it *True*, concerning the *Athenians*, to whom he was then *Preaching*, as well as concerning *himself*. For even the *Breath of Life* was inspired into *Adam* by *God* himself, *Gen. ii. 7.* And therefore communicated to *all Mankind*, so far, the honour of being descended from a *Divine Original*. *Tertullian* himself grants it of the *Matrix Animæ* of *Adam*, though he makes *all the Souls* of his *Descendants* the same way begotten by his *Soul*, as their *Bodies* are by his *Body*. And this *God* gave him with a *design* of making him *naturally* neither *Mortal* nor *Immortal*; but *capable* of either, by the determination of his own *Free-will*. If he purged himself from the Pollution of *carnal* desires, he was put in hopes of being *Immortal* by the accession of the *Spirit*. If not, he was left to his *natural Mortality*, as accordingly it proved in the *event*. This *God* designed for all his *Posterity* as well as *himself*, as designing to put *all* in the same advantages. And though his *Posterity* be not put in *actual* possession of the *Spirit* as he was, yet the *status* they still retain, and all the *Pretensions* that can give them of *qualifying* themselves for a *Union* with the *Spirit*, by the use of so much *Free-will* as can remain after the expulsion of the *Spirit* it self. But upon so
much

much *harder* terms, than he, as it is *harder* to *acquire* the *Union* with the *Spirit* than to *keep* it when they were possessed of it, *antecedently* to the use of their own *Free-will*. This I take to be the sence of *Tatian* in the place before mentioned. So he goes on; Γέγονε μὲν ἐν συνδιαίῳ ἀρχῆθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ. That is, in the Person of *Adam*, Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ταύτην ἔπειθαι μὴ βυλομένην αὐτῷ καταλείπειν. This *desertion* of the *Spirit*, seems to be alluded to in the words of *Genesis*; *My Spirit shall not always strive with man*, *Gen. vi. 3.* at least, as to the *general* desertion of the *Spirit*. *Tatian* adds, Ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ ἔναυσμα τὸ δυνάμεως αὐτῆς κεκλήμενη, καὶ διὰ τὸ χωρισμὸν τὰ τέλεια καθορᾶν μὴ δυνάμενη, ζητῶσα τὸ θεόν, κατὰ πλάνην πολλὰς θεῶν ἀνετύπωσε, τοῖς ἀντισοφιστεύσει δαίμοσι κατακολυθίσασα. This seems to be the *light shining in the darkness*: Yet so that the *darkness* could not lay hold on it. That *darkness* himself before interpreted to be ἀναπιστήμων ψυχῇ. Nor can that ἔναυσμα be the *Spirit* it self, which he immediately after denies to be in *all men*. His words are very express, Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ θεῶν παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐκτὸς. What therefore can it be, but an *external Irradiation* of the *Spirit*, which, being *obeyed*, will *qualifie* the well disposed *Souls* for a *Union* with the *Spirit* it self? So he; αἱ μὲν πεφορμαῖ σοφία, σφισιν αὐταῖς ἐφείλοντο πνεῦμα συγγενές. He owns there-

fore a *συζύγεα* between the *πνοή*, the Soul it self, and the *πνεῦμα*, because they were originally united by God, who intended they should still have continued so in all men, if men had not been wanting to themselves. This I take to be the meaning of the Apostle, when he owns all Human Souls, as distinct from the Spirit, to be the Off-spring of God; Yet so as to allow none for Sons, but them who have the Spirit of Adoption, which is not otherwise to be expected now, but in our Christian Baptism. *Πνοή* is enough for the one, but *πνεῦμα* is requisite for the other. But the former alone cannot give any necessary Right to the other, but only a Capacity. As all Free-born Persons are capable of the highest Offices in a Society, which notwithstanding are not many, and therefore can be enjoyed only by a few.

39.

No ordinary means settled for conveying the Spirit before the Gospel.

But the way how the former may qualify for the latter, as it is little observed now, so it is necessary to be further explained. But from the Notions and Reasonings of the first and purest Ages, it is certain that, as there was no claim from Human Nature in general, that could entitle all men to this Supernatural Principle of the Spirit; so neither was there any Promise or Divine Revelation, that God would be pleased to give that to all men, which none could challenge on any other Title. No Covenant after Adam with Mankind in general, that every

Indi-

Individual should have it restored to them, since they had *lost* their claim by the *Covenant* with *Adam*. No *Divine Covenant* with any *particular Nation*, but the *Old Peculium*, till the *New Covenant* by *Christ*. Nor any *Covenant*, even with the *Jews* themselves, expressly relating to their *Souls*, and the *Life to come*, so far from any express *Stipulation* for the *Spirit*. No *Sacramental Symbol* then for conveying it to any, as a *Principle* of a *New or Diviner Life*, which was the only consideration that could entitle the *Receiver* to *Immortality*. The *Spirit* that was then conveyed by the *Symbol* of *Unction*, was plainly of *another kind*, relating to *Gifts* rather than *Graces* of the *Spirit*; and *Gifts* of a *lower kind*, relating principally to *publick Offices* in this *Life*, and therefore principally for the good *Administration* of the *Visible Body* rather than the *Personal Benefit* of the *Receiver*. The conveying it by a *Covenanting Symbol* to be received by *every particular Member*, and as a *Principle* of *Divine Life*, is the peculiar *Prerogative* of the *Gospel*. And since this *Ordinary way* of conveying it is *settled*, and *settled* by a *Divine Establishment*, and that for *ever*, there is no reason why any now should expect it, who uses not the *ordinary visible* means appointed by *God*, for receiving it. No more than *Naaman* could pretend to a cure of his *Leprosie*, by any

Waters besides those of *Jordan*, after *God* had been pleased to *confin*e his own *favour* to that *particular River*. But *before* that *Confinement* of the *Gospel*, the *limitation* of the *Old Peculium* seemed principally to relate to the *Favours* of *this Life*; as their *secular Government* was a *Theocracy*, and as they might hope to *over-rule* the *Interests* of other *Nations*, by having a more *potent Numen*, whenever their *Interests* should be *inconsistent*. Their *Plea* therefore to the *Spirit* on this account, was no other than as the *Spirit* was the *ordinary Administrator* under the *Supreme Being*. And no other could, on this account, lay any *claim* to the *Spirit*, than as they were concerned in the *Administration* of the *Civil Government*. So their *Princes* were; and their *Priests*, as they were principally privileged with the *Oracle* of *Urim*, and the *Case* of *Jealousie*, and the *miraculous Cures* of *Leprosie*, and the *Expiation* of *Piacular Sins*, which might bring *temporal Judgments* on the *whole Body*; and their *Prophets* also, as employed on *Divine Messages*, or *consulted* on their *Temporal Affairs*. All these, if they ever meddled with any thing relating to the *Future Life*: it was but *occasionally*, and beyond the *Expectation* of the *Dispensation* then obtaining. But these *Claims* were all grounded on the *Offices*, rather than the *Vertues*, of the *Persons* who then

received the *Spirit*. And were only of *Gifts* more necessary for the *Publick*, than designed for the *Personal* benefit of those who had the *Gifts*. These therefore can have nothing to do with the *Inhabitation* of the *Spirit*, as a new Principle of a *Diviner Immortal Life*, which was never intended to be confined to *Offices*, but was by God originally designed as a *Reward* of *Personal Vertue*, even in *Adam* himself, and therefore in all his descending *Posterity*. *Prophetick Instinct*, and *Divinatory Dreams*, and *Occasional Afflation*, were sufficient for those ends of *Government*, which required no constant *Inhabitation*, much less any *Animation*, of the *Diviner Spirit*. That therefore which might contribute to the receiving the *Spirit* thus understood, in order to the *advancing*, and *immortalizing*, the *Nature* of the *Person* who received it, must be something common to all the *Members* of that *Peculium*, and wherein none might be able to plead any *Prerogative* above his *Brethren*, but what might be imputable to his better use of those same *Expedients* which were common to their whole *Body*. That could be no other but the common *Discipline* of the *Dispensation* under which they lived. For there was then no *Revelation* concerning God's design of receiving all particular *Members* to that highest of all Favours of which their *Nature* was

capable, or receiving the Spirit as a Principle of a new Life, distinct from the Covenant made with Adam, who had forfeited it for himself and his Posterity. And it is certain, by the Revelations of the New Testament, That it was not thus actually given to any then. Because it was the Office of the same Aoyō who was the second Adam, the Man from Heaven, who gave the Spirit to Adam himself, that he could alone renew the Spirit to his fallen Posterity. All therefore that could be done then, was to qualify themselves, as to those dispositions which were in their Power, for receiving the Spirit, when the appointed season should come for giving it. One qualification God had given them, without their own contribution; that is, That they were all born of the Patriarchal Seed, and descended from those Ancestors to whom God had made Promises, and entered into Covenants for themselves and their Posterity. And, though the Spirit was no particular Article of these Covenants on God's part; yet their being chosen for God's particular Care and Patronage, made them the most likely Candidates for unknown arbitrary Favours; even such Favours also, as had not been originally designed for all who participated in the same common Human Nature, as this was. But as they were of the Patriarchal Seed, they were incorporated into that Body, of which

our

our Lord himself was the *Head*, and consequently were entitled to all the Purchases of his *Blood*, though themselves did not then know it. And among them the *Principal* was the *Spirit*. But whether *Rebels* among them should be *immortalized* to *Punishment*, may not possibly seem altogether so clear. Yet there is rather reason to believe they *might*. Their *Theocratical Government*, even then, was believed to be under the administration of the *Λογος* immediately, whose *Spirit* it was, that had so great a share in the *subordinate Administration* under him. As therefore his *Spirit* is said to have been *grieved* by those *Rebels*: so *Christ* is said to have been *tempted* by them. And he is said to have been *afflicted* in all their *Afflictions*, on account of his *Sympathy* resulting from his *Matrimonial Unity* with them. For the *Λογος*, not the *Father*, was supposed to have the *Schechinah*, which made him capable of *conversing* with *Mankind*. Thus their *Rebellion* against the *Theocracy*, under which they lived then, may make them responsible to our *Blessed Lord*, as committed against his *Person*, and as properly reflecting on him, who is to be the *Judge*, and as he was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, and the *Legislator* of the *Decalogue*, as well as their other written *Laws*. But this was common to them all, and only qualified them *conditionally*, if they observed

the Ceremonial *Expiations* prescribed by the Law it self, which God was pleased to accept as Expedients for promoting that Purity of Mind which was requisite to qualifie them for a Union with his own Divine Spirit. This was in their own power, and on this depended the Event, as to particular Persons, as to the entitling them particularly to the Rewards or Punishments of the Dispensation respectively. Yet even this alone was not thought sufficient for attaining the Spirit. It was to be attained by the Old Dispensation, no otherwise, than as the observing it, entitled those who did so to the Benefits of the New, among which this of the Spirit was the Principal.

40. Faith is (by the Terms of the Gospel) requisite for receiving the Immortalizing Spirit.

This therefore being given only by the new Dispensation, could not be expected, by any who lived under the old Dispensation, on any other Terms, but those of the new. And the general Condition, required from all by that, is Belief. This our Blessed Lord declares, as the Rule of his Procedure in that Judgment, by which he intends to adjudge Eternal Rewards and Eternal Punishments, that *he that believes and is baptized, shall be saved; and that he who believes not, shall be damned.* The Baptism is that of the Spirit, which is that which must immortalize. And the Just himself cannot expect to live, that is, this Immortal Life by his Justice, that is, by his real

real *observing* of the *old Law*, but by his *Faith* prescribed by the *new*. But, as the *Apostle* reasons, *Faith comes by hearing*, *Rom. x. 16, 17.* which he gathered from *Is. liii. 1.* The *Word*, we there translate *report*, is in the *Greek* *ἀκὼν*. Thence the *ἀκὼν πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, *Gal. iii. 2, 5.* That therefore the *descended Members* of the *old Peculium*, might be qualified for the *Benefits* of the *new*, it was requisite they should *believe* the *Gospel*; and, in order thereunto, it was withal as requisite that they should *hear* it. This therefore was by the *Antients* believed to be the Cause of our *Blessed Lord's* Descent into *Hell*, as *Hell* is taken for the *common Receptacle* of *Souls*, both *good* and *bad*; that is, that he might there *preach* the *Gospel* to them, who *never* heard of it while they were on *Earth*, to *qualifie* them for their final Sentence by their *Faith* or *Disbelief* of it. The Testimonies of *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Origen*, are very plain and full to this Purpose, not now to mention the more numerous ones of *lower Ages*, which (I know) will be less regarded. The Foot-steps of this Opinion are so *unanimous*, and so *near* the *Apostolical* Original, and so *agreeable* to the *Principles* and *Reasonings* of the *Apostolical* Age, and so *uncontradicted* by any *Monuments* of those *Times*; that it is hard to conceive how they could have any other *Original* than

Clem. Al.
Str. ii. &
Strom. vi.
Origen
contr. Cels.
l. ii.

than *Apostolical*. I shall mention only some of the most antient.

41.
Therefore
the An-
tients
(even of
the Apo-
stolical
Age) be-
lieved,
that our
Saviour
preached
to the se-
parate
Souls of
those who
deceased
before his
Incarna-
tion.

Such is that *Eph. v. 14. Wherefore he saith, awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the Dead, and Christ shall give thee Light.* This is the same with the *Immortal Life, S. John i. 4.* And it is an Address to the *Dead*, who are frequently said to *sleep*, in the *Prophetical Style of the New Testament*; and the *Light* seems to allude to the *Baptismal Illumination of the Spirit*, upon owning the true *Faith*. Such is that also of *S. Peter, 1 Ep. iii. 18, 19, 20. Christ hath also once suffered for Sin, the just for the unjust (that he might bring us to God) being put to Death in the Flesh, but guided by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the Spirits in Prison; which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.* The *Spirit* here cannot be the *Spirit of Christ* in *Noah* or any other *Patriarch* then living, but the *Spirit of Christ* himself who is here said to have been the *Preacher*. That very *Spirit* wherein he lived at the same time wherein he was alive, at the same time that he was put to *Death in the Flesh*; that *Spirit* which is elsewhere opposed to his *Flesh, 1 Tim. iii. 16.* That *Spirit* which is ascribed to him as the *second Adam*, and the *Lord from Heaven*, and which is called a *quickning Spirit, 1 Cor. xv. 45.* as being

self *uncapable* of dying, and as being a
Principle of Life to all others that partake
 of it. Nothing could be more properly
 mentioned on this occasion, than that very
Spirit in which he might be *present* with
 them, though *absent* in the *Flesh*, 1 Cor. v.
 3. Col. ii. 5. Than that *Spirit*, which, upon
 their *Belief* of his *Preaching*, was to be given
 them also in its *First-fruits*, in its *earnest*,
 as a *pledge* of their *Immortality*, and a *Prin-*
ciple by which it was to be confirmed. Nor
 could this *Preaching* in his *Spirit* agree to
 any *time* so conveniently, as *that* where-
 with it is here *joyned*, when he was *put to*
Death in the Flesh; that is, to the *space* be-
 tween his *Death* and *Resurrection*. And the
 words *sometime disobedient* plainly imply,
 that their *Disobedience* was long *before* the
 time wherein they were *preached to*. And
 his *Preaching* is plainly *distinguished* from
 the *Preaching* of *Noah*, the *Preacher of Right-*
eousness, 2 S. Pet. ii. 5. That *time* of *Noah*,
 is said here to be the *time* of the *long suffer-*
ing of God, wherein 120 Years were allow-
 ed them for a *respite*, Gen. vi. 3. and is op-
 posed to this *new Preaching* of *Christ*, where-
 in there was *no such respite* granted, no
 such *Argument* of *long-suffering*, but their
 final *Answer*, whether they would *believe*,
 was expected within the *space* between the
Death of our *Lord* and his *Resurrection*.
 Here was the *fittest season* for visiting those
 Pa-

See Disc.
of Marriage,
&c.

Patriarchs in the same Spirit, which was to restore them that Spirit, as a security for their Immortality, which was withdrawn from them generally in those days of Noah, when God expressly warned them that his Spirit should not always strive with men. This seems to relate to the Image of God restored to Seth after the Fall of his Father, which was not taken away from their Body till this time. The Children of Cain had long before lost their Title to it, not only on account of Adam, but also of Cain himself, who never had the Spirit himself, that he might derive it to his Posterity. And the Scripture it self opposes this to have been the Case, when it calls the Sons of Seth only the Sons of God, and the Daughters of Cam the Daughters of Men, because it is this Spirit of Adoption which entitles us, even in the new Peculium, to the honourable style of being the Sons of God. So again the same S. Peter, iv, 6. For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to Men in the Flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit. Here it is plain, that the Spirits in Prison are the departed Souls of them who were then dead when the Gospel was preached to them; and therefore that the Preaching cannot be understood of the Preaching of Noah, or of any other Person who preached to them while they were yet alive.

alive. It appears also that the *design* of this *Preaching* was, that they might *live* a *Life* undoubtedly that was no *necessary* consequent of their own *Nature*, and which they could not have had but by the benefit of this *Preaching*, and the *Flexibility* of their own *Wills*, by which they might be enabled to *receive* the *Benefit* of this *Preaching*. And this agrees with the words: *that they might be judged according to Men in the flesh*. The meaning could not be, that this *Preaching*, which was designed for *entitling* those *dead* Persons to *Life*, could give Men then *living* any *Reason* to judge those as still in the *Flesh*, who were punished in the *Deluge*. But rather that notwithstanding Men then *living* were possessed with *hard* thoughts of the *final* state of those who perished in the time of *Noah*; yet, by the *benefit* of this *Preaching*, many should be *found* entitled to this *Immortality*, which was the *Privilege* of the new *Peculium*. The Expression, though it may seem strange, is yet exactly parallel to that of *S. Paul*, *God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which was delivered you, Rom. vi. 17.* That they had been the *servants* of *Sin*, could be no *Reason* of thanks to *God*, but rather that which followed in the *Apodosis*: that, though they had been formerly the *servants* of *sin*, they had now *obeyed from the heart the form of the*

See Disc.
of Marri-
age, &c.

Patriarchs in the same *Spirit*, which was to restore them that *Spirit*, as a security for their *Immortality*, which was withdrawn from them generally in those days of *Noah*, when *God* expressly warned them that his *Spirit* should not always strive with men. This seems to relate to the *Image of God* restored to *Seth* after the Fall of his *Father*, which was not taken away from their *Body* till this time. The Children of *Cain* had long before lost their *Title* to it, not only on account of *Adam*, but also of *Cain* himself, who never had the *Spirit* himself, that he might derive it to his *Posterity*. And the *Scripture* it self opposes this to have been the Case, when it calls the *Sons of Seth* only the *Sons of God*, and the *Daughters of Cam* the *Daughters of Men*, because it is this *Spirit of Adoption* which entitles us, even in the new *Peculium*, to the honourable style of being the *Sons of God*. So again the same *S. Peter*, iv. 6. *For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to Men in the Flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit*. Here it is plain, that the *Spirits in Prison* are the departed *Souls* of them who were then dead when the *Gospel* was preached to them; and therefore that the *Preaching* cannot be understood of the *Preaching of Noah*, or of any other Person who preached to them while they were yet alive.

alive. It appears also that the *design* of this *Preaching* was, that they might *live a Life* undoubtedly that was no *necessary consequent* of their own *Nature*, and which they could not have had but by the benefit of this *Preaching*, and the *Flexibility* of their own *Wills*, by which they might be enabled to *receive* the *Benefit* of this *Preaching*. And this agrees with the words: *that they might be judged according to Men in the flesh*. The meaning could not be, that this *Preaching*, which was designed for *entitling* those *dead Persons* to *Life*, could give *Men* then *living* any *Reason* to judge those as still in the *Flesh*, who were punished in the *Deluge*. But rather that notwithstanding *Men* then *living* were possessed with *hard* thoughts of the *final* state of those who perished in the time of *Noah*; yet, by the *benefit* of this *Preaching*, many should be *found* entitled to this *Immortality*, which was the *Privilege* of the *new Peculium*. The Expression, though it may seem strange, is yet exactly parallel to that of *S. Paul*, *God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which was delivered you, Rom. vi. 17.* That they had been the *servants* of *Sin*, could be no *Reason* of thanks to *God*, but rather that which followed in the *Apodosis*: that, though they had been formerly the *servants* of *sin*, they had now obeyed from the heart the form of the

the doctrine which was delivered to them. But this censorious Judgment of Men here, supposes the Preaching to have been to them in their separate state, because the good event of it was unknown, and therefore could be no restraint to censorious Persons who knew nothing but the hopeless condition of their entrance on the state of Separation. A like passage is preserved by S. Justin Martyr and Irenæus, so antient then as to be ascribed to either Jeremiah or Isaiah. The words are these: ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτῶν τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γλῶσσαν καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελισάμενος αὐτοὺς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτῶν. S. Justin charges the Jews with cutting these words out of the Prophecy of Jeremiah. So in the Latin Book of Ecclesiasticus: Penetrabo omnes interiores partes terræ, & inspiciam omnes dormientes, & illuminabo omnes sperantes in Domino, xxiv. 45. These are so early Authorities, and so esteemed by them who lived in the next Age to the Apostles, that it is hardly possible that they could be inconsistent with the then notorious Traditions. But, being plain Consequences from these Principles now proved Catholick, they can hardly be otherwise than Catholick themselves. Nor would it have been mentioned in so many Creeds, unless the Churches that so inserted them, had thought them of more Consequence and Authority than private

S. Justin,
Dial. cum
Tryphon.

p. 298.

S. Iren. l.

iii. 23.

iv. 39, 45,

56, 66.

v. 26.

Opinions. And the *literal* Sence of the *Descent* into *Hell*, is that which has always had the greatest *Authority*. As for our own *Church*, we still retain the *Clause* of the *Te Deum* that favours it; *When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of Death, thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all Believers*. It is plainly here said to be, when our Saviour had overcome the sharpness of Death, which exactly agrees to the space between his *Death* and *Resurrection*. Then it was, when he was in *Adns*, that he opened the kingdom of heaven to those who believed, in the place where himself was. That is, who believed in *Adns*. But they could not believe without a *Preacher*, *Rom. x. 14*. He must therefore preach in *Adns*. Here therefore the *Kingdom of Heaven* is opened to the deceased in *Adns*, on the terms now mentioned, of *Faith*. And in our first *Articles*, in *Edw. the Sixth's* time, our *Church* was exprels for a *local Descent*, and quoted for it the forementioned passage of *S. Peter*, in the *Article* it self. Though she has since been pleased to forbear the imposing it, in the *later Edition* under *Queen Elizabeth*.

Besides, by the terms of the Gospel, 42. *Baptism* is necessary, as well as *Faith*, for Water Baptism also necessary (by the Gospel) for receiving the Spirit, which therefore the Antients believed to have been given to the separate Souls of them who had no means of attaining it when living.

recovering our lost *Immortality*. Our Saviour's words are very express: *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*, S. Mark, xvi. 16. Faith alone therefore is not sufficient Security for this *Salvation*. So *Baptism* is said to save us, 1 S. Pet. iii. 21. And not only the *Baptism* of the Spirit, as the immediate Principle of *Immortality*, but the *Baptism* of Water also, as the only ordinary means appointed by Christ for obtaining the Spirit. In this also, our Saviour's words are very express: *Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, S. Joh. iii. 5. This therefore is another Reason of Preaching to such separate Souls as had not, before death, heard of our Blessed Lord and his Gospel, that they might not only be converted to a Belief of him, but be Baptized also. And that even with the *Baptism* of Water. So the Apostolical *Hermas*: * *Quare de profundo hi lapides ascenderunt, & positi sunt in structuram turris hujus; cum jampridem portaverint Spiritus justos? Necessè est, inquit, ut per aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant. Non poterant enim aliter in regnum Dei intrare, quam ut deponerent mortalitatem prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, & intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est: ut ubi accipit illud sigillum, libe-*

* L. iii.
Similitud.
ix. n. 16.

liberatur à morte, & traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt verò vitæ assignati: & illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum; & usi sunt eo, ut intrarent in regnum Dei. Et dixi: Quare ergò, Domine, illi quadraginta lapides ascenderunt cum illis de profundo, jam habentes illud sigillum? Et dixit: Quoniam hi Apostoli & Doctores, qui prædicaverunt nomen Filii Dei, cum, haberetur fides ejus & potestatem, defuncti essent, prædicaverunt his qui ante obierunt, & ipsi dederunt eis illud signum, κηρύγμα. [what follows, is from Clemens Alexandrinus] κατέβησαν ἕν μετ' αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν. Ἄλλ' ἔτοι ζῶντες κατέβησαν, καὶ πάλιν ζῶντες ἀνέβησαν· ἐκεῖνοι δ', οἱ περὶ κεκοιμημένοι, νεκροὶ κατέβησαν, ζῶντες δ' ἀνέβησαν. Διὰ τούτων ἕν ἐξωποινήθησαν, καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ τούτο καὶ συνανέβησαν μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ συνήρμοσαν εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομίαν τοῦ πύργου, καὶ ἀλατόμητοι συναρκοδομήθησαν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐκοιμήθησαν καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ ἀγνείᾳ· μόνον δ' τὴν σφραγίδα ταύτην ἔχον. We see here that neither the great Exactness in observing the Law prescribed them (that is their δικαιοσύνη) nor their Abstinence from Pollutions, Legal or Mystical, (that is their ἀγνεία) was thought sufficient to entitle those to this immortal Life, who died before our Saviour's Incarnation, without an explicit Faith in him, and Baptism, even that

of *Water* also, in order to their *further* Purification, and to the entitling them to the *Spirit*. This, very probably, might be the Reason of the *Practice* alluded to by the *Apostle*, of *Baptizing for the Dead*, 1 Cor. xv. 29. It might have been, on these *Principles*, for *known Believers* who had *qualified* themselves for all the Favours of the *Gospel*, by *living* suitably to the *Faith* professed by them, but had, by some Providence, unavoidable by *Human Diligence*, been taken away *before* they had received the Sacrament of *Baptism*, and might therefore be believed to have a very just *Title* to the *Equity* of the *Baptismal Covenant*, though they had none by the *Letter* of it. In this Case they might hope to entitle such rightly *disposed* Persons (who wanted nothing requisite on their *own* parts, that *was, or ever had been, in their own power*) by putting them into *possession* of it, as far as they were able *then*, in the Persons of their *Susceptors* or *Stipulators*, which the *Law* allowed in many Cases, where the Duty to be performed was not perfectly *inseparable* from the *Person*. This might especially be presumed, when the *deceased* Person had received the *Spirit* immediately on his *Conversion*, and before his *Baptism*, and had withal *external Evidences* of his having received it, in visible *Shechinahs*, and the gift of *Tongues*, and such other proofs as might

might satisfy, even *Unbelievers*, as they did *Simon Magus*, even when he was in the *gall of bitterness*. This was not unfrequent then, I am apt to think it was *usual* in the *first Conversions* of a *Province*, and especially in the *Case* of the *first Converts* in it. And the *Reasoning* of the *Apostle* from it, seems to suppose it in this very place of the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*. He speaks of such a *Baptism* as could have no effect but upon the *Body*, and which therefore could have no effect, if the *Body* of him who had been *initiated* by it, should not *rise*; that is, of such a *Baptism* which could have no other effect, but that of making them *one Body* with *Christ*. Such that *Baptism* must be, which was administered to them who were already *one Spirit* with *Christ*, by their having *actually* received his *Spirit*. To such their remained no *other Union* than could be ascribed to their *later Baptism*, but the *Bodily one*, by their being *Baptized* into the *one Body* of *Christ*, which is true only of the *Water-Baptism*, in *contradistinction* to the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*. And indeed his whole *Reasoning* proceeds only on that *Baptism* which made them *one Body* with *Christ*. The *Consequences* will not hold otherwise, that if *Christ's Body* was raised, theirs must be raised also: Nor on the contrary, That if their *Bodies* should not *rise*, they could not truly own the *raising* of the *Body* of *Christ*.

Both Arguments suppose them *one Body* with *Christ*; that is, in a *Mystical* Sence, *Members* of his *Body*, of his *Flesh*, and of his *Bones*, as the same *Apostle* does elsewhere express it. And this seems to have been the *Reasoning* against these *Hereticks*, against whom the *Apostle* here disputes. They pretended the *Resurrection* was past already, *2 Tim. ii. 18*. Their meaning seems to have been, not, as it would now be popularly understood, as if a bare *change* of *Manners*, a *rising* from *sin* to *newness* of *Life*, had been all the *Resurrection* that was promised by the *Christian Religion*: But that the *Resurrection* was the *winging* of the *Soul*, by which it was enabled, when it pleased, to mount again to *Heaven*, where it was supposed to have been *originally* before its fall into the *Body*. For this *Wing* the *Christians* called the *Spīrit*, which was given in the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*. This was pure *Platonism*, and generally the sence of those *Philosophers* who were for *Religion*, and agreed with them in particulars of this kind. But then these *Philosophers* were not concerned what became of the *Body*, because they thought it *penal* and *preternatural* to the *Soul*. They would therefore have taken the *immortalizing* the *Body* for a design of *perpetuating* its *Exile* and *Punishment*, rather than of reducing it to its *primitive* and most *perfect* State. This made the

Chri-

Christian Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body so unacceptable to the learned of those Ages, and the contrary Doctrine so pleasing to the *Hereticks*, who were more influenced by the *Authority* of the *Philosophers* than of our *Blessed Saviour* and his *Apostles*. And the ground of that Opinion was, that those *Philosophers* believed the *Soul* naturally *Immortal*. Thence it was obvious for them to infer, that such *Bodies* as ours are, that are fitted with *Organs* proper for restoring the decays of the *Individuals*, and for perpetuating the *Species* by the production of new *Individuals*, could not be natural to it, because both those kinds of *Organs* suppose the *Mortality* of the *Individuals*. For confuting therefore of this received Opinion, it was very proper to shew that *Christ* had raised his own *Body*, and therefore did not believe it *preternatural*, or *inconsistent* with the perfect *Happiness* of his exalted State: This he proves by that Topick (which, in that near *Memory* of the *Fact*, was most proper for a Subject of that Nature) of the *Testimony* of those who had seen him after his *Resurrection*, most of whom were still living, and might yet be consulted by them who doubted of it. This therefore being granted, he proves further, that the *Christian Sacraments* were designed to make us one *Body* with him, as well as one *Spirit*. Thence it followed, that if his glorified State

required a *Body*, ours must do so too : And therefore that the *contrary Doctrine* ruined the *credit* of all those *initiatory Rites* by which they had been made *Christians*, which were purposely designed to *assure* them, that their *Bodies* should share in their *immortal Happiness*, and therefore must *themselves* be made *immortal* also, v. 14, 15. Accordingly he shews in 2 *Tim.* ii. 18. that it had this effect on some, that it made them *abandon* the profession of *Christianity* it self, as rendring all their pretensions to *Divine Revelation* suspicious to those who more firmly believed the *inconsistency* of the *Corporeal State* with *Celestial Happiness*, than the *Testimony* of those upon whose *Credit* they had received their *Christianity* it self. This I take to be the importance of those words, *and overthrow the Faith of some* : for had it been only a denial by *Consequence* of what they *owned* by their *Communion* ; it must have overthrown the *Faith*, not of *some only*, but of *all* who *believed* that *Doctrine*. But to those who were more perswaded of the *Truth* of *Christianity* than of *that Doctrine*, it was very proper for the *Apostle* to urge this avowed *Practice* of the Church. And the rather, because he seems to suppose it so *generally* received, as that some of his *Adversaries* had been *concerned* in it, not considering how *inconsistent* it was with their new *Herefie*. I mean that of *Baptizing*
those

those with a design of thereby securing them from *Death*, who could not (by their own Principles) be in *danger* of any other *Death* besides that of the *Body*, as being already secure of the *Spirit*. This was certainly the case of *Cornelius*, who was baptized with *Water*, notwithstanding he had already received the *Spirit*. It is not therefore a Personal mistake on which he reasons in this Case, as is commonly conceived. This Apostolick Author shews that this Baptism of *Water*, was thought as necessary to secure from *Death*, as that of the *Spirit*. Hence therefore we understand, how necessary it was (by the Principles even of that purest Age) that the separate Souls of their Predecessors should have Baptism of *Water* as well as *Faith*, for securing them of the Resurrection of their *Bodies*. I know it will be thought strange, how separate Souls could receive Corporeal Baptism. And very probably it would have been thought as strange then as now, if the Doctrine had been the same then as now, concerning the pure spiritual Nature of the separate Soul. But as they then thought the Souls incapable of receiving any impression from *Fire*, without some degree of Corporeity; so the same Body that qualified them for *Fire* might make them capable of Lustrations by *Water* also. Indeed Lustrations by *Fire* and *Water* were usual in their Mysteries, and were

thought beneficial by *Plato* for clearing themselves from the *βόρβορος*; the corporeal pestes, as *Virgil* calls them, that hindered their ascent to Heaven. And *Water* particularly was made use of in their annual *Februa* to the *Dymanes* on the first of *February*, which Month received its Name from that Solemnity, this *Tertullian* seems to intimate to have been taken up by the *Hereticks* also. This shews how inclinable the *Christians* were to entertain the same Notions of their *Baptism*, where they had no warning given them to the contrary by any *Revelation* of the *Gospel*, which is not so much as pretended in this Case.

43.
Renuncia-
tion of the
Devil ne-
cessary for
the Spirit,
which was
also believ-
ed perform-
able in the
separate
state, by
those who
could not
know their
Duty be-
fore.

There was also a third condition requisite to qualifie, even separate Souls, for the benefits of *Christianity*. That is, an actual and explicit *Repentance* of their *Idolatry* and worship of *Devils*, for those who had been actually guilty of it, how well soever they meant, when that was their Case. Other sins were purged by a general *Repentance* upon their first initiation into the Church by their *baptismal Washing*, without any particular satisfaction for what was past. But this *Communion* with the *Devil* made them *Members* of that *Body* of which the *Devil* was the *Head*, which their *Baptismal Profession* obliged them expressly to renounce, before they could be received into that new *Mystical Body* of which our *Blessed Saviour*

is

is the *Head*. This therefore was requisite to be their *own express Act*, and *Personal*, as *those* had been of their *Communion* with the *Devil*, by which they had entitled themselves to *share* in that *Fire*, which was *not* prepared for *them*, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*; and for them *no otherwise*, than as they had, by their *own Act*, made their *own Cause* the same with *his*. But when they *had* done so, it was, in *reason*, to be expected that they should, by the like *express Acts* of their *own*, rescind what they had done formerly, in order to the *disengaging* themselves from the pernicious *Consequences* to which they had thereby made *themselves* obnoxious. Till they had done so, they were incapable of that *Communion* with *Christ*, which was to entitle them to the benefits of his *Death*, and the *Life* and *Immortality* purchased by it. I easily foresee how apt our *Adversaries* are to make the Case of *separate Souls* extraordinary, and therefore accountable by no other *means* but such as are, like the Case it self, *extraordinary* also. And so there may indeed be *reason* to reckon it as to what is *Extraordinary* in it, that *Overtures* should be made to them in the state of actual *Separation*. That must *not* indeed be *expected* by *them*, who have had the *Gospel* sufficiently notified to them while they were in their *Bodies*. Their determination *here* must conclude
then

then for ever. That may make *their* Case seem Extraordinary, if our *present* Case be taken for the *Standard* of what is *Ordinary*. Otherwise, if the *Rule* of the *greatest* numbers be taken for the *Ordinary Rule*, that may perhaps, have as good a Title to the name of *Ordinary* as *ours*. It is reasonable to believe, that it was as *constant* in all who lived before our Saviour's *Incarnation*, as ours is in all who lived *since* the *publication* of the *Gospel*, who *heard* of it. And the numbers of those who lived in so many generations before, must needs be greater than the numbers of those who lived *since*, and *heard* of the *Gospel*. It must therefore have been, at least, as *ordinary* a *Rule* then, as *ours* is now. However this is very reasonable, that, seeing the *future immortal Celestial Life*, and the *Spirit* as the *cause* of it, are only attainable by the *Gospel*; they should be attained by the *means* and *qualifications* prescribed by the *Gospel*. Nor can it be denied but that these three, of *Faith*, and *Water-Baptism*, and *Renunciation* of our past *concord* with the *Devil*, the capital *Adversary* of our Saviour, are plainly supposed and required by the *Constitution* of the *new Peculium*. And equitable *Dispensations* with the known *Laws* of a *Society*, are never designed by *Legislators* but for *rare* Cases which cannot be provided for by *general Rules*, and wherein therefore few Persons

Persons may be concerned. To do otherwise would encourage *breaches* of the Law, if very many might expect the *favour* of the Legislator, and that *ordinarily*, and in *course*. Much more if the *numbers* of such *Favourites* were greater than of those who lay claim to his *favour* in the *ordinary* and *allowed* way of gaining his *Favour*, that of *keeping* his *Commandments*. It would be a reflection on the *Wisdom* and the *fore-sight* of the Legislator, to leave great *numbers* destitute of a *Rule* to go by. And much more so, if they were *more* who might expect the *protection* and *favour* of his *Society*, in the notorious *breach* of his *Laws*, than in *observing* them. Other *Secular Governments* do indeed secure their *main* ends, if they can secure the *performance* of their *Laws* by their *Subjects* in *this* *Life*, at least, as to a *majority* of their *Subjects*. The reason is, because all *Duties* to such *Societies* *expire* with *this* *Life*, beyond which the *Rewards* and *Punishments* do not *extend*. But that is not the Case with *Souls*, whose *main* concern relates to the *future* *Life*, and to *this* *Life* no otherwise than as their behaviour *here* may contribute to the *Happiness* or *Infelicity* of the *Future* *State*. It is therefore very agreeable that even *separate* *Souls* should be obliged to comply with the *means* prescribed by the *Gospel* in order to the attaining that *Immortality* which was *not* otherwise attainable than

than by the Gospel. This therefore is a further inducement to make the *Fact* appear credible, which is otherwise so well attested by witnesses of that Apostolical Age.

44. The Gentiles also are owned by Hermas to have received the Spirit by our Saviour's Baptism in their separate State.

Thus therefore it appears, that separate Souls of Persons who dyed before the Incarnation, received the immortalizing Principle in their separate State; and that this was actually believed in those earliest times.

Clemens observes further, from this passage of *Hermas*, that others as well as Jews, were allowed the Benefit as well as Favour of it. His words are: Ο ποιμὴν ὁ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κηκοιμημένων θεὸς τῶν ἀνθρώπων δίδωμι δικαίαν οἰκονομίαν ἐν ἔθνεσι καὶ ἐν Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ μόνον πρὸς τὸ κυρεῖν παρθεσίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς νόμον, κατὰ τῶν πρὸς θεὸν εὐαρέσχησιν, ὡς Ἀβελ, ὡς Νῶε, ὡς εἴ τις ἕτερος. διχαί. Strom. ii. p. 163.

Hermas makes no express mention of *Abel* or *Noah*. But the words alluded to by *Clemens* are these: *Decem, qui in fundamentis collocati sunt, primum seculum est. Sequentes viginti quinque; secundum seculum est iustorum virorum, L. iii. Simil. ix. n. 15.* The first Ten are the *Ante-diluvian Patriarchs*, among whom *Abel* may be reckoned to fill up the number, if *Adam* be excluded, who first forfeited the Spirit. For so he adds afterwards: *Hi primi Spiritus illos portaverunt, & omnino alius ab alio non recesserunt, nec Spiritus ab hominibus, nec homines à Spiritibus; sed junctam fuerunt hi Spiritus eis usq;*

usq; ad diem quietis: qui, nisi hos Spiritus secum habuissent, non fuissent utiles structuræ turris hujus. This was not true of Adam, but of the rest it was; because the Desertion of the Spirit from the generality of Mankind was first in the days of Noah, as I have already observed. And the justî of the second Seculum are the Persons alluded to by Clemens in the words, εἰ τις ἕτερος δὶκαίος. These are the Persons alluded to by S. Paul, Heb. ii. and commended by him on account of their having pleased God by Faith, v. 5, 6. Plainly in opposition to the Law; and therefore on the same Terms with the Gentiles under the new Peculium. And he urges, to this purpose, their living before the Law, meaning, not only the Law of Moses, but the Law of Circumcision given to Abraham, by which the first confinement of the Peculium was made to a particular Nation. Thus Clemens does not misunderstand nor misapply this place of Hermas, though that Author himself has no express mention of the Gentiles. It is withal observable, that Hermas owns these first Patriarchs to have had the Spirit, and that to the time of their Death, as neither having deserted his conduct, nor having been deserted by him. Yet even these he makes dead in reference to the Spirit conferred on them by the Apostles in the state of Separation. The Apostles who had received our Saviour's Baptism on Earth,
are

are therefore said in this *Baptism* of these *separate Souls*, to descend into the *Water alive*, and to rise out of the same *Water alive* also. Not so these just *Patriarchs*, who had this *Spirit*, and who had been so punctually *obedient* to it, as never to have been *deserted* by it. Yet even they wanted the *quickning Spirit* of our *Saviour*, till it was conferred upon them by that *Baptism* of our *Saviour*, which was administered to them by his *Apostles*. They could not have been said to have been *dead* when they descended into the *Baptismal Water*, if in their descent, they had already received that same *quickening Spirit*, which made them *alive* when they *ascended* out of that same *Water*. The *Spirit* therefore received by them before was only *External*, not an inward *animating Principle* of a new and *immortal Life*, which might entitle them to *Heaven*, the Seat of *Immortality*. This is no more than what the *Apostle* teaches us when he tells us, that they *received not the Promise*; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect, *Heb. xi. 39, 40*. What is this *Promise*? No other than the *ἡς δέσμων καὶ ἀνεύροια*, as *Philo* expresses it: The *Heavenly Canaan*, and the *New Jerusalem* from above, the proper residence of the *Man from Heaven*: The *City* which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God, *v. 10*. The better

Coun-

Countrey, that is, the Heavenly, prepared
 for them by God, v. 16. In regard of which
 he only sojourned in the land of promise, as
 in a strange Countrey, dwelling in Tabernacles
 with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of
 the same Promise, v. 9. Their dwelling in
 Tabernacles, is insisted on as an Argument
 of their not possessing that Land as Inhabitants,
 but as Sojourners. And this again is urged
 to prove, That they dyed in Faith, not
 having received the Promises, but having seen
 them afar off. As their dwelling in Taber-
 nacles is urged to prove, That they confessed
 that they were Strangers and Pilgrims in the
 Earth, v. 13. Heaven therefore is the Pro-
 mise here intended, which therefore they
 had not yet attained, who had not yet re-
 ceived the Promise. And the Spirit also is
 a Promise, as it is a necessary qualification
 for Heaven it self. The Promise of the Fa-
 ther, S. Luke xxiv. 49. Act. i. 4. ii. 33. And
 therefore, as a Promise of the Father, pro-
 mised not only by the Son, but by the Fa-
 ther also, in the Mystical Interpretations of
 the Old Testament, without which the other
 Mystical Promise of Heaven could not be
 performed to them. The exceeding great
 and precious Promise, by which we are par-
 takers of the Divine Nature, 2 S. Pet. i. 4.
 That very Spirit which is the Prerogative
 of our Saviour's Baptism. So the Apostle
 very expressly: In whom also after that ye
 be-

believed, ye were sealed with the Spirit of Promise, which is the earnest of our Inheritance, Eph. i. 13, 14. The Earnest must necessarily go before the Inheritance. Yet that very Earnest could not be received by these Patriarchs till they had heard and believed the Gospel, and had also received the Seal of Baptism. All which our Apostolical Author *Hermas* makes performed to their Souls in the state of Separation. Yet *Hermas* owns that the same Patriarchs had deceased in Righteousness and in great Purity: ὅν δὲ καιοσύνην ὁκοιμήθησαν, καὶ ὅν μεγάλη ἀγνεία. These are very proper dispositions for receiving the Divine Spirit. Yet they are not all, he owned formerly that they had the Spirit, and had ne'er deserted him, nor been deserted by him. How then comes it to pass that he makes them dead at their descent into the Baptismal Water? That he makes them quickened by the Apostles who baptized them? So himself owns in the following words: Δια τέτων ἐν ἐξωποικίθησαν καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. So he supposes, when he makes them ascend alive out of the same Baptismal Water into which they had descended dead, he gives the Answer himself: That, notwithstanding these advantages, they still wanted the Seal of Baptism: Μόρην δὲ τὴν σφραγίδα ταύτην ἔχον. We see here clearly, That having the Spirit as a Guide and an external Assistant,

is not *alone* sufficient to entitle to that *Life* that is *Immortal*; by these *Principles*, our having it so can only put us into that *condition* wherein *Adam* was before his *Fall*, which was only a *mean* between *Mortality* and *Immortality*, indifferent to either. But the *immortalizing Principle* is the *Spirit*, as initiating us into a new *Life*, as a new *animating vital Principle*. So it is a *Principle* of a new *Birth* and a *Regeneration*. And so it is not to be expected any other way, than by our *Saviour's Baptism*, by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*.

But our *Saviour's Preaching*, lasting only while his *Soul* together with his *Spirit* was in that *superiour Adm* (which was the *Receptacle* of the *better Souls* who were *qualified* for his *Favour*, according to the *Opinion* of *Clemens Alexandrinus*) could therefore be presumed beneficial *only* to the *Jews*, who were *then* the *only Peculium*. Our *Saviour's* first *Commission* to his *Apostles* was: *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, S. *Matth.* x. 6. He plainly here confines their *Preaching* to the *Jews*, so as to forbid it to either of their *Rivals*: either the *Gentiles*, or even the *Samaritans*. Not only so; He owns the *confinement* of his own *Commission* to them *alone*. So he answers the *Canaanitish Woman*: *I am not sent, but*

45.

Our Saviour's Preaching was only to the Souls of the Jews, the Apostles was also to those of the Gentiles, according to the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus.

unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, xv.24. So it was for the *time* of our Saviour. And though he gave himself intimations that the Gentiles should afterwards be admitted immediately to the same Privileges; yet they were (for preventing the Prejudices he knew them then possessed with against it) in such wary Expressions, that even the Apostles themselves were not, without difficulty induced, even then, either to receive or preach to the Gentiles. This therefore gives a clear account of the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus, why he ascribes the preaching to the Jews in *Adns* to our Saviour; but that to the Gentiles, to the Apostles, and other principal Doctors under the new Dispensation. His words are: Δίδεικται ὃ καὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ Στρωματί [p. 163.] τῆς Αποστόλης, ἀκολουθῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ εὐηγγελισμῶν. Ἐχρῆν γὰρ, οἶμαι, ὥσπερ καὶ ταῦτα. ὅπως ὃ καὶ εἴσε τῆς ἀρεῖας τῆς μαθητῶν μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τῷ διδασκάλῳ. ἢ ὁ μὲν, τῆς ἐξ Ἑβραίων. οἱ δὲ, τὰ ἔθνη εἰς ἐπισηροφῆν ἀγαγῶσι. τῆς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, τῇ κατὰ νόμον καὶ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν βεβιωκότας μὲν, ὡς τελείως δὲ ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτηρικῶς, διαπερανάμενος τὸ βίον. Τῷ γὰρ ἐπρεπεῖν τῇ θεῇ οἰκονομίᾳ, τῆς ἀξίαν μᾶλλον ἐρηκότας ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ προηγουμένως βεβιωκότας, ἐπὶ τε τοῖς πλημμεληθεῖσι μετανενοηκότας, καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ τύχωσιν ἐξομολογούμενως ἐν τοῖς τῷ θεῷ ὄντας τῷ παντοκράτορι, κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκάστου γινώσκον

ὑποδοί, ὁδοί, Str. vi. p. 271. The Doctrine of Profelyting and receiving Gentiles into the new Peculium were first revealed clearly, after our Saviour's Ascension, in the time of the preaching of the Apostles. And accordingly the Extraordinary Apostles, S. Paul and S. Barnabas, began the Practice of Preaching to the Gentiles, in Act. xiii. The other Apostles learned this Doctrine from them, as they had done the other of admitting Gentile Profelytes, from S. Peter, and his success also in the case of Cornelius. But they did not put it in Practice till 12 Years after our Saviour's Ascension, if we may believe the antient Tradition of Apollonius in Eusebius, and the very antient Apocryphal Book concernig the Preaching of S. Peter, observed by Clement himself. Thenceforward therefore they were prepared for performing the same Office of Preaching to the deceased Gentiles, being themselves deceased, which they had performed before to their living Posterity, whilst themselves were living. This was very agreeable to the Notions of those Times, that separate Souls retained the habitual impressions contracted here, and were therefore delighted in doing the same things in the state of Separation, which had been acceptable to them in this World. And it was very proper that this Office should be performed by our Blessed Saviour himself and his Apostles, because they are the

True Catholick Church, from whom all particular Churches derive their Title to Catholicism, by their Communion with them, who have the Archetypal Communion with the Father and the Son, as I have shewn in my Parænesis. For separate Souls are incapable of the mediate Communion, which is sufficient to make our Visible Churches Catholick, by Visible Symbols, administred by Visible Authorized Representatives of the Heads of the Mystical Communion, the Father and the Son. And therefore can be united to them no otherwise than by an immediate Union, if they be admitted to any Union at all. He adds withal, that it is the Employment of our Lord as a Saviour to save his own Workmanship, where-ever they are, that is, whether in the Body or out of it, by drawing them εἰς ὁμνησίαν. And indeed the ὁμνησία from Matter, and fleshly Lusts as the Nails to Matter, hindring the Ascent of Souls to Heaven, is owned by the Philosophers, and ascribed by them to the Λόγος as well as by the Scriptures. They also were sensible of their duty of following God, and disposing themselves for it by Purity of Flesh and Spirit. They expected a Union with God by these Purgations. So Porphyry in his Life of Plotinus, pretends himself twice to have enjoyed this Union, and S. Justin Martyr expected it, before his Conversion to the Christian Religion, by his Philosophical

cal Purgations, as himself informs us in his *Dialogue with Tryphon*. And they who practised them were stiled *Σαῖοι*, and were thought to have *Divine* and *Theurgical* Virtues as well as others, as being thereby made themselves *Divine*, which must therefore entitle them to *Heaven* upon their *Dissolution* from their *Bodies*. He further adds, That the *Punishments* inflicted by God on the *Gentiles* in their *separate State*, were *σώτῃς*, and *παιδείξαι*, and *εἰς ὁμολογίαν ἀγνοῦν*. The word *ὁμολογίαν* is thus used by the *Philosophers*, as well as the *Sacred Writers*, for a *Conversion* of their *Thoughts* from *Worldly* to *Heavenly Objects*, To which he subjoins a farther advantage of the *separate State* for this purpose, that *Souls* in that condition can see more clearly, though darkened by remaining *habituated Passions*, on this very account, that they are not diverted by attending to the *fleshy Principle*: διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ὁμολογίαν σαρκί. He mentions also the Argument from God's being no *Acceptor of Persons*, which is the same that is observed by *S. Peter* in the Case of *Cornelius*, *Act. x. 34*. And allowed by *S. Paul*, *Rom. ii. 11*. And with this very application to the Case of *Jews* and *Gentiles*. That in relation to *Souls*, and the concerns of the *future State*, *Gentiles* are as acceptable to him as *Jews*. That is, That in every Nation, he that feareth him,

and worketh Righteousness is accepted with him, *Act. x. 35.* as *S. Peter* himself interprets that Phrase. The Privileges therefore of the Jews, as a *Peculium*, ought not so to be understood as to be inconsistent with this, because *God* never was an *Accepter of Persons*. And the *Primitive Writers*, and the *Apostle* in *Heb. xi.* prove it from so many of the *Patriarchs* as were *εὐάρεστοι* to him, before he was pleased to fix upon a *Peculium*, and have the name of *Righteous* ascribed to them in the *Scriptures* themselves, as *Noah*, *Lot*, *Job*, and others. Accordingly he distinguishes between two *Righteousnesses*, κατὰ νόμον and κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, and makes *Philosophy* to have the same power for qualifying the *Gentiles* for the Favour of the *Gospel*, that the *Law* had for the *Jews*. Or, if *Righteousness* must necessarily have a relation to a *Law*; yet even so, *living well* is the same thing as *living Legally*; and a *living* according to the *Rule of right Reason*, the same with *living* according to *Law*. So he: Ἐν γὰρ τὸ καλῶς βίον, καὶ νομίμως ὅτι βίον· καὶ τὸ εὐλόγως βίον, κατὰ νόμον ὅτι βίον· Ὁρθῶς δὲ βεβιωκότες οἱ πρὸ νόμου εἰς πίστιν ἐλογίσθησαν, καὶ δίκαιοι εἶναι ἐκριθέντες. This *Life* was imputed to them for *Faith*, so far as they were capable of *Faith* without a *Preacher*, by the *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, in *Heb. xi.* And that *Faith* was imputable to them for *Righteousness*. I see nothing

in this *Hypothesis* of S. Clement, but what is allowable by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*.

But the *Foundation* of this whole Discourse, seems to be grounded on the *original Equality* of all *Humane Souls*, of those who were *without*, as well as of those who were *within*, the *Old Peculium*. Both sorts bore *originally* the *εἰκὼν* of *Adam*, and could pretend to nothing *higher*, than what they could derive from *him*. Nor could the *Jews* pretend to any *Dignity* of their *Souls* above the *Gentiles*, as descended from their proper *National Patriarchs*. No *εἰκὼν* from any of them, distinct from that which was common to the *Gentiles*, as well as *them*, from *Adam*. This made it look like *accepting of Persons*, if *God* had dealt so *unequally*, in distributing these *greatest* of his *Favours* to *Persons* who had otherwise so *equal Pretensions* to them. That *they* were also the *Divine Off-spring*, is owned by S. Paul, when he quotes the *Passage of Aratus the Poet* to that Purpose with *Approbation*. This made them *all* alike entitled to the *Care of Divine Providence*. Accordingly, when the *Apostle* speaks of the *πνεῦμα*, the *Principle of Immortality*, as the *εἰκὼν* of the *λόγος*, and therefore deriveable only from *him*; he opposes it only to the *ψυχὴ*, which he calls the *εἰκὼν* of *Adam*. What can be more obvious

46.

No Patri-
archal Co-
venant can
oblige Po-
sterity to
consent to
the Hazard
of Eternal
Misery.

from hence, than that he did not here consider *Men* as descended from any *subordinate Patriarch*, but as the Seed of *Adam*, to whom the *Gentiles* had as fair a Claim as the *Jews* themselves? The *Old Peculium* therefore could not, in Affairs relating to *Souls immediately*, challenge any *Privilege*, on account of their *proper Patriarchs*, and the *particular Covenants* made by God with *them*. Not one of *those Covenants* ever mention any thing relating to the *separate Condition* of *single Souls*. All of them concern *Posterity as Bodies*, and are sufficiently satisfied in the good or ill *Successes* of the *Bodies*, how *anomalous* soever the Case might be of *single Members* of those *Bodies*. They might be *happy* in the *Calamities* of their *Nation*; and on the contrary, very *unhappy* under the *prosperous Successes* of the *Publick*, notwithstanding their own strict *Observance* of their *Duty*; nay, for that very Reason, because they did observe it. Many *Heroical Virtues*, are *Occasions* of *Personal Calamities*. Withal the *Interests* of *private Persons*, are *inconsistent* with those of the *Publick*. And in *these Cases*, the *better* the *Men* are, the *more* they must think *themselves* obliged to submit to what may make their *Persons miserable*, when their *Private Happiness* is *inconsistent* with that of the *Publick*, or where their *private Calamities* may promote the

the *Prosperity* of their *Nation*, or their *Country*. But then this can only hold in such Cases, wherein, all things consider'd, the *Publick Good* may *countervail* their own *private Inconveniences*, and wherein they *themselves* may have *Reason* to *believe* it a sufficient *Compensation* for what they *suffer* by it. And so they may, while the *Evil* is *finite*, and can reach no farther than their *Bodies*, though it be *Death* itself, and that with *Torment* too. And it has been often thought so by *wise* and *considerate* Persons. The continued *Protection* of their *whole Lives*, and the *Honour* thereby purchased to their *Memory*, and the *Favour* to their *Posterity* and *Friends*, and *Well wishers*, and even the *Good* of the *Publick* itself, may be judged a sufficient *Compensation* in the *Opinion* of *grateful* Persons, who value the *Publick* beyond all *Posterity*, or *private Benefactors*. But *Eternal Misery*, of what *Degree* soever, can admit of no possible *Compensation*, even in the *Judgment* of *reasonable Gratitude*. And what is *unreasonable* cannot, for that *Reason*, be thought *virtuous* or *commendable*. Here therefore every *private Person* must *judge* ultimately by his *private Interests*. For no *Publick Law* can *oblige* any further than its *Rewards* and *Punishments*: That is, than its *Rewards* may be *great enough* to make *Amends* for all the *Evils* that may be incurred by *complying* with

with it; and its Punishments greater than can be recompensed by all the Advantages that may be gained by Disobedience. But *Eternal Misery* cannot be countervailed by any *Legal Rewards* of Obedience. No *Patriarchal Covenant* therefore can oblige *Posterity* to submit to *Eternal Misery*, on Consideration of any *Publick Interest* whatsoever of the *Patriarchal Family*. Nor can it therefore undertake for their *Posterity*, in such a case where any *single Soul* may be exposed for the *Good* of the *Community*. The *Covenants* therefore of *this World*, must be transacted with each *single Individual*, so as to put it in his own Power, whether he will, or will not, be eternally miserable. What may be done by *God's absolute Power*, I am not now concerned to enquire. It is sufficient for my Purpose at present, that even *God's* proceeding at that rate, is not agreeable to those *Rules of Justice and Equity* received among *Men*, which even he himself owns and appeals to in the *Scripture*, as the *Measures* of his *Proceedings* with his *reasonable Creatures*. No *Man* can reasonably submit his *Eternal Interests* to the Hazards of another's fallible Judgment and flexible *Free-will*, on any Consideration whatsoever of other *Advantages*. Nor can *God's Goodness* permit him to necessitate a *reasonable Creature* to act contrary to the *Nature* with which he has endued it; that is, to
 Submit

submit to the Determination of another, in such a case where no *rightly informed Understanding* can judge a Submission reasonable. This is therefore a Case wherein every single Rational Being, has a *Right* to determine for itself, and not to be concluded by the *Act* of any *Patriarchal Ancestors*.

But in other Cases whereby *Rights* are gained by *Posterity*, sufficient to make *Amends* for any consequential *Inconveniences*, it is but reasonable, that where *Posterity* gain *Rights* by the *Acts* of their *Predecessors*, they should be obliged to bear with such consequential *Inconveniences*. But this can reach no farther than what they have received from their *Fore fathers*, which is their *Bodies*, which being, as derived from them, confessedly *Mortal*, can expose them to no *Sufferings* that can be *Eternal*. As for their *Souls*, if they be derived also from their *Ancestors*, that very Consideration alone would be sufficient to prove them *Mortal*, by the *Reasonings* of those *Ages* we are speaking of, of the greatest *Authority*. But if they be indeed *Immortal*; so far, as they are so, they could not be derived from their *Parents*, nor could they consequently be liable to all *Obligations* contracted by their *Ancestors*. However by their *Bodies*, the *Posterity* of the *Old Peculium* had great *Advantages* above the rest of *Mankind*, even with Relation to *God*, and *Conveniences* for

47.

God appropriating the Old Peculium, did not exclude the Gentiles then living from the Benefits of the New Peculium relating to their Souls.

for their Souls. Their Nation was taken immediately into the Divine Protection of the Supreme Being ; not mediately, like other Nations. This secured them of a more powerful Patron, whenever their Interests should be inconsistent with the Interests of any other rival Nations. Then their Government was Theocratical, so long as themselves endured it should be so ; that God himself nominated the Persons that should be their Supreme Governours, who could not fail of choosing fit Persons for that Purpose, as themselves did, when he was prevailed on afterwards, by their Importunity, to permit the Government to the Hazards of an Hereditary Succession. Yet even then they had the Assistance of Divine Oracles, for the Direction of the Governours, for the time being so long, as they were willing to be guided by them, even for their Secular Affairs. That of Union in the High-Priest, and of their Prophets, empower'd with sufficient Credentials to prove their Divine Mission, and these surer than those which were given to other Nations, by inferiour subordinate Demons. Withal, that the Messiah, the Incarnate Λόγος, the great Restorer of Souls, was to derive his Flesh from them. This was a great Endearment of them to him, and gave them a great Security for expecting Favours from him, according to the received Notions of those Times.

Times, concerning the *Duties* good Men were obliged to pay to their *Nations* and *Countries*. Yet our Saviour very frequently gives them warning not to reckon on this *Carnal* Relation, and signifies that good *Dispositions* of *Mind* were much more valuable to him, wherever he found them, in reference to the End of his own Coming. He seems to check his own *Mother*, when she concerned her self in the Exercise of a Power greater than any he had *derived* from her. He prefers the Case of *bearing* the word and *keeping* it, before that of the *Womb* that *bore* him, and the *Paps* that had given him *suck*. Such he owns for his *Mothers*, his *Sisters* and his *Brethren*, rather than those who had those Relations to his *Flesh*. He values *Nathanael* more on account of his being a *true Israelite*, and ἀδολῶ without any *Indications* of *vδεία* and degeneracy from his famous *Ancestors*, than on account of his *Extraction* from them. This is the *true Israelitism*, which is so often afterwards *opposed* to *Israelitism* according to the *Flesh*, the *Seed* of *Abraham's Faith*, which he had *while* he was yet *uncircumcised*. So he declares his *Approbation* of the *Faith* of the *Syrophœnician Canaanitish* Woman, after he had seemed to upbraid her with her *Descent*, and try'd her *Constancy* in *bearing* the *Reproach*. And in the Case of the *Centurion*, he wonders and declares, that he had not found so great

great Faith, no, not in Israel. Plainly intimating that to be more esteemed by him, than being descended from Israel. Thence he takes occasion to foretel the Reception of the Gentiles in the Peculium; that many should come from the East and West, and should sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob [the so much boasted Patriarchs of the Jews] in the Kingdom of Heaven, when the Children of the Kingdom should be cast out into outer Darknefs. Which plainly shews, that our Blessed Lord never had the least regard to eminent Examples of Virtue among the Gentiles on that account, that they were not of the chosen Seed. On the contrary, he rather seems to censure that Confinement of their common Offices of Humanity to their own beloved Nation, when he recommends the Behaviour of the good Samaritan to the wounded Man, beyond that of the Priest and Levite, who passed by unconcerned, because he was no Jew, when the Samaritan had pity on him, though not more nearly ally'd to him, than they were, on a National Account. Rather he prefers that Virtue which he finds where he had least Reason to expect it, where himself had bestowed the least Cultivation. There is therefore no reason to expect that our Blessed Saviour should confine his Design, as a Saviour of Souls, only to the Souls of the Old Peculium. In truth, the

the whole Ground of the *chusing* that *Peculium* itself, was, that he might thereby reward the *Moral Virtues* of their *Ancestors*. God himself owns the *Faith* of *Abraham*, the *Father* of the *Faithful*, in being willing to part with his only *Son*, when God was pleased to require him, as the *Reason* of *chusing* his *Posterity* for his *Peculium*. Because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy *Son*, thine only *Son*: In blessing, I will bless thee; and in multiplying, I will multiply thy *Seed* as the *Stars* of *Heaven*, and as the *Sand* which is upon the *Sea-shore*; and thy *Seed* shall possess the *Gate* of his *Enemies*: And in thy *Seed* shall all the *Nations* of the *Earth* be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my *Voice*; Gen. xxii. 16, 17, 18. These last Words are applied to *Christ* himself by the *Apostle*, Gal. iii. 16. By which we understand that the *Interest* the *Jews* had, even in the *Flesh* of *Christ*, and all the *Honours* and *Favours* resulting from thence, were the *Rewards* of that *Personal Act* of *Abraham*. But this was indeed after his *Circumcision*. However there are the like *Promises* made to him, upon his *first Act* of *Faith*, in leaving his *Country* at *God's Command* (that very *Particular* not excepted, which relates to *Christ*) that in him all the *Families* of the *Earth* should be blessed, Gen. xii. 1, 2, 3. This was before his *Circumcision*, on account of that *Faith* which he had,

had, being yet *uncircumcised*, *Rom. x. 9, 10.* on which account all who are the *Children* of his *Faith*, are as much *entitled* to the *Promises* made to him and his *Seed*, by the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*, and of the *first Fathers*, as the *Jews* themselves. And though *Circumcision* had been *necessary* to entitle to that *Covenant*, of which *Circumcision* was a *Seal*: yet it was not the *Circumcision* of the *Flesh*, but of the *Spirit*, that was the *true Mystical Circumcision*, which was the *Circumcision* that was *acceptable* to *God*, by the same *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*. And of this *Circumcision*, *Gentiles* were as *capable* as the *Jews* themselves. And these *Reasonings*, in both *Cases*, are grounded on *Testimonies* of the *Old Testament*, proving the *Interpretations* agreeable to the *Mind* of the *Legislator*, even *then*, as the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament* generally prove those things which the *Jews* took for *Innovations* in the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*, to be so far from being *really* *Innovations*, as that they were also always more *designed* by *God*, and more *antiently* so, than the *literal Interpretation* of the *Law*, which seemed so *inconsistent* with them. These *Rules of Reasoning* will reach the *Gentiles* who lived *then*, as to the *Equity* of them, as well as those who lived after the *Promulgation* of the *Gospel*. And, in truth, I cannot imagine what
 Abra-

Abraham could have for recommending the first Acts of Faith, which entitl'd him to the following confirming Covenant with him and his Children, that could not be pleadable with as much Equity for any Gentile Patriarch then living, who had been as good as Abraham, as it was for Abraham himself. And, though there was no Patriarch then living, who gave the same Evidence of his absolute Resignation to God by any outward Act, as Abraham did, that could not, in Equity, be any Exception against the Acceptableness of the like Heroical Acts of any of the Posterity of such Patriarchs, who had no Promise or Covenant for Acceptance derived from their Ancestors. However such pious Successors were in the same Condition, as to their single Persons, as Abraham was, before the Covenant that appropriated the Old Peculium. And therefore had the same Plea for Acceptance, as he had, in Equity: especially with him, who, in this very Case, professes himself to be no Acceptor of Persons. And, however they might fail of a Title by their carnal Ancestors; yet they had one by Abraham himself (as many of them, at least, as lived after him) by these Christian Reasonings. They were also the Sons of his Faith, though not of his Flesh. They had the true Seal of the Circumcision, not of the Flesh, but of the Spirit; which even the

Prophets themselves of the Old Testament look on as the truly beneficial Circumcision. And, by this means, they must also be qualified to be Members of that Mystical Body, of which our Saviour is the Mystical Head, which will, in Consequence, entitle them to the Spirit, that they who are one Body in him, may be one Spirit in him also. I know not how this Reasoning can be avoided, in Relation to the Mystical Benefits of even that Peculium, of which kind all they are that relate to the future State. And such alone are they for which the Writers of the New Testament are concerned. They did not rival the Jews in their Title to the Earthly, but the Heavenly Canaan; not to the Earthly, but the Heavenly Jerusalem. This Reasoning therefore did not hinder but that Carnal Extraction from Abraham, or an Incorporation into his Patriarchal Body by a Carnal Circumcision, were the only Legal Means that could convey a Right to the Earthly Canaan, and the Earthly Jerusalem. Nor did they hinder, but that even that Relation to our Saviour's Flesh, and their being the natural Olive into which others were to be inoculated, at least mystically, in order to a Participation of their mystical Sap and Fatness, were great Prerogatives of the Jewish Nation. Nor does the Apostle ever allow them more, even when he is most liberal in his Concessions to them.

He

He never owns any *Advantage* of theirs above the *Gentiles*, as to *purely Spirituals*, and, in regard to the State of their *separate Souls*, supposing *equal Dispositions* in both Cases. Nor does he suppose this *Spiritual Equality* preached by the *Gospel*, to have begun with the *Promulgation* of the *Gospel*, but to have been as *old* as the *Gospel* itself, before *Ages and Generations*, and before the *Foundation of the World*. Plainly implying it, as to *God's Design* of it, to have been *elder* than the *Law of Moses*, or the *eldest Foot-steps* of that which was commonly taken for the *elder Peculium*. This is sufficient for my Purpose to shew the *Probability* that *God* never intended to exclude the *Gentiles* from the *Benefits* their *Souls* might receive by our *Saviour's Incarnation*. Not even those, who were not then *incorporated* into the *Jewish Nation*, by a *Carnal Circumcision*. Which being supposed, the Assertion of *S. Clement* cannot be thought *strange*, that *Philosophy* might perform the same Office for the *Gentiles*, which the *Law of Moses* did for the *Jews*, in preparing them for the *Spirit*, which neither of them could receive as an *immortalizing Principle*, but by the *Gospel*. What is this *Philosophy* but the *Moral Duties* of the *Mosaic Law*, being owned as *reasonable and obliging* by the *Philosophers*, who were the *Guides* of those *Gentiles* who knew nothing of the *Law of Moses*.

And what is this but the Law written in their Hearts, which the Apostle owns as sufficient to make it Law to those who find it so? This doing the things prescribed in the Law, under the Sense of an inward Conviction, that they were obliged to do so, seems to be what God himself calls having his Law written in their Hearts, and witnesses earnestly, that it were his Peoples Case. Why then should we wonder if it should prove acceptable to him in the Gentiles also?

48. The Scripture therefore supposes all other Humane Souls equal with those of the old *Peculium*; and that it would be acceptance of Persons with God to treat equal Souls with unequal Favours, when considered singly, without relation to the Bodies to which they belong. It owns no inequality in Mankind in general, but what is made by that Accession of the Spirit, as an animating Principle of new Life, which is not given but by our Saviours Baptism, and is therefore proper to our new *Peculium*. But you desire to know how this *accessional Spirit* is distinguished from the Soul, and from the Divine Spirit, which is the third Person in the Trinity? I shall therefore endeavour to explain it according to the Sense of the Scripture. And indeed as the word Spirit signifies breathing, by which we live, every Principle of Life

The highest part of the Rational Soul (as distinguished from the Divine Spirit) is called a Spirit, yet naturally mortal.

Life is called Spirit, so this is the Spirit of the Dead, that goes downward to the Earth, opposed to the Spirit of Man that goes upward, Ecc. 12. 7. So again, the Spirit of Man, as differing from the Beast, is opposed to the Divine Spirit, what Man knoweth the things of a Man, yet the Spirit of a Man which is in him, even so the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God, in Cor. 13. 11. And, The Spirit beareth Witness with our Spirit, that we are the Children of God, Rom. 8. 16. This may be thought strange, that this supreme Degree in Man, should be contradistinguished from the Divine Spirit. But before I can speak to that, I must first shew what that Principle in Man is, that is called Spirit, and yet opposed to the Divine Spirit. This plainly appears in the place now mentioned, where it is opposed to the Spirit of a Beast. I must therefore be that Power which is proper to Man, and which distinguishes him from the Beasts which have no pretence to it. That is, Understanding. Therefore the Beasts are said to have no Understanding, Ps. xxii. 3. And the Man that has no Understanding, is said to be like the Beasts that perish, Ps. xlix. 13, 20. That Principle therefore which makes him like Beasts, must make him perishable as they are, and therefore cannot secure him from actual Mortality. That is signified by the

Spirit of the Beasts going downward to the Earth. As all the space below the Heaven is called Earth, and is supposed to be the Region of Death, the תהום Valley and Shadow of Death, and the Darkness of this World, as the World contains the Air also. This therefore is the Condition of that Man which was formed out of the Dust of the Ground, Gen. ii. 7. the χῆς in the Greek. This obliged him to return into the Dust again, Gen. iii. 19. Eccl. xvii. 1. Wisd. vii. 1. which is the reason why the Gnosticks made this Choical Man so Mortal, as not to survive the Dissolution of the Body, and therefore to have no place in the future State, not so much as in that which they call the State of Mediety below the Pleroma, the place of the Eternal Æons. This part of the Soul included the concupiscible and irascible Powers, all that were not Rational. This the Hereticks ascribed to lower Powers than the Supreme Being; and for that Reason made them Mortal. Either the Angels or the Demurgus, whom they reckon'd for a lower Being below the Pleroma, were supposed to be the Authors of them. And that, with this very Design, that Man might consist of a Mixture, some things Mortal, and some Immortal. The Doctrine of the Platonists, whom they followed, was, that whatever was produced by the Supreme Being, could be no other but Im-
mortal.

mortal. Therefore, that the *World* might have of both sorts, other *Inferior* Beings were to be produced (*Mortal* of their own Nature, and *Immortal* only by the Pleasure of God) which were to produce those things which were designed for *Mortal*. Which Reasoning they applied to *Man* the *Micro-cosm*, as a Being constituted of *Mortals* and *Immortals* also. Nor did the *Hereticks* alone follow herein the Opinion of the *Platonists*. *Philo* also is too favourable to it; *Phil. de. Mund, op. & Allegor.* but that Reasoning is certainly false: For if God could not produce *Mortals*, they could never have been produced at all; because the first of them could never have received its Being, but from something that was Self-originated and *Immortal*. I only mention their Opinion, to shew that they also were agreed in the *Mortality* of this lower Soul. But whether they had been so agreed or not, I am not much concerned. It is sufficient for my Purpose, that the Scripture does not countenance it, which, notwithstanding, is sufficiently clear, in asserting the *Mortality* of this lowest Degree of the Soul.

And this indeed I take to be that which 49. the Scripture calls *ψυχή* simply. For when it has the Accession of that *Divine Afflatus*, which is called the Spirit of a Man, it is then called *ψυχή ζωα*. So the Words of *Yet it is, in a lower sense, Divine, as being of a Divine Original,* and as qualifying us for a Union with that truly Divine Spirit, by which we are actually immortalized.

the Greek Interpreter imply, which is the Text of the New Testament Writers: Καὶ ἐπλάσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁμοίου ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον ζῶον, καὶ ἐπλάσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. Gen. ii. 7. Here is an ἄνθρωπος supposed before the Divine breathing. Certainly not a dead Man, which is indeed no Man, but a Man animated with that lower Soul, which is common to him and Beasts; and therefore cannot be imputed to a Divine Breathing. Which was the Honour the Psalmist speaks of, that distinguished him from the Beasts that perish. However that lower Soul supposes him endued with all those Powers which belong to that lower Life, which we call Animal, in Opposition to that which is properly Rational. It must therefore be a higher Life that made that, which before was only ψυχή, to be now a ψυχὴ ζῶσα. And such a Life as was worthy of its Original, the πρῶτον ζῶον by which it was conveyed; which therefore must be Divine, that it might answer its Divine Original. In truth, the same Life which is given by the Divine Spirit itself, only in that lower Degree, which is imply'd in the Phrases used concerning them, of ψυχὴ ζῶσα and πνεῦμα ζῶσαν. The one only implies a derivative, precarious, dependent, participation of the same Life, which is supposed to be so originally in the πνεῦμα, as that it can

communicate to others the same Life, of which itself is the original Principle. This *πνὴ* is that which the Fathers, from *Ἰω. xlii. 5.* suppose to be common to all *Μαντικὰ*. And indeed this Spirit of Man, properly so called, as distinguished from the Spirit of God, is notwithstanding so mentioned in the Scriptures, as a peculiar *ἰσχύς* where in Man is superiour to all other visible Animals. So it is in the *Psalm*, now mention'd. So in the viiith *Psalm*, which is a professed *Encomium* of that Man immediately, yet secondarily of the Man from Heaven, *Ebr. ii. 7, 8.* who is the same with the Lord from Heaven, and the quickening Spirit, *1 Cor. xvi. 35, 37.* who is called the Son, and the second Adam, and Christ in the same Chapter. And it is implied in the particular Concern God was pleas'd to take upon himself, for producing this living Soul above what he had shew'd in producing the Soul it self. So, *πῶς ὁ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν ἀνδραπόδης*, *Prov. xx. 27.* Thus we understand the Words of *Tatian*, who says that the Soul of Man is Darknes. His Meaning was *comparatively*; as when the Light that is in us is said to be Darknes, *S. Matth. vi. 23.* *S. Luke xi. 35.* So this very *πνὴ* is Darknes, in comparison with the *πνεῦμα* as the greater Light, though otherwise it also is *πῶς*, and *πῶς ὁ πνεῦμα*, which can hardly be understood of any but that mystical *πῶς*, which

which is derived from the λόγος, and whose proper Seat is in the Region of Light, which is opposed to the Darknes of this World. Thus the Spirit of Man is said to go upwards, in the forementioned place of Ecclesiastes: That is, when it returns to God that gave it, Eccl. xii. 7. So Philo also explains the difference between this πνοή and πνεῦμα. His Words are very remarkable for clearing the Notions of the Hellenists, concerning this Matter. And they are these: Πνοήν δ', ἄλλ' ἢ πνεῦμα εἶρηκεν, ὡς διαφορὰς ὕψους. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πνεῦμα γενόηται κατὰ τὴν ἰσχύον καὶ εὐλογίαν καὶ δύναμιν· ἡ δὲ πνοή ὡς ἀναῦρα τις ἐστὶ καὶ ἀναθυμίασις ἡρεμαία καὶ περαία. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα γεγονώς καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν ὡς, πνεύματος ἀνὰ λόγον κεκοινωνήκεναι. Ρῶμ. γὰρ ἔχει ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτῶν. Ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τῆς κρένης καὶ ἐλαφρότερος, ὡς ἀνὰ διαφορὰς τινός, ὁποῖαι γίνονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρωμάτων. Φυλαττομένων γὰρ ὑδρὸν ἥττον καὶ μὴ ἐκσυμψυμένων, εὐωδία τίς γίνεται. This πνοή is plainly distinguished from the ὁ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα γὰρ, as weaker, as Flesh and Spirit are usually opposed in Scripture, when weakness is ascribed to the Flesh, and Strength to the Spirit. That is not all. This πνοή is owned to be material, like the Steams of odoriferous Bodies. That Consideration alone is sufficient to cut it off from any Pretensions to any proper natural Immortality. Yet he makes this to be the οὗς by which

which the mystical *ἔνωσις* is made with the *Divine Spirit*. So before: *Τεῖα γὰρ εἰ δαί*
τὸ ἑμπνέον, τὸ δεχόμενον, τὸ ἑμπνεόμενον.
Τὸ μὴ ἔν ἑμπνέον, ὅτιν ὁ θεός τὸ ὃ δεχό
μενον, ὁ νῦς τὸ ὃ ὁππνεόμενον, τὸ ὃ ὁππνε
όμενον, τὸ πνεῦμα. Τί ἐν ὁκ τῶν συνάγε
ται; Ἐνωσις γινέσθαι τῶν τελῶν, τείναί@. τῷ
θεῷ ἢ ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς δύναμιν διὰ τῷ μίσεσ πνεύ
ματος ἄχρε τῷ ὁποκειμένου. The *νῦς* here
 mentioned, is afterwards called *ἀνθρώπινος*
νῦς, which he says, would not *dare* to as-
 pire so *high*, ὡς ἀνιλαβίδαι θεῷ φύσει, if
 God himself had not *drawn* it to him, as a
Humane Mind is capable of being *drawn*.
 The *δεῖα φύσις* is the *Holy Ghost* in *S. Peter*.
 And its *drawing* the same with that men-
 tioned by our Saviour, when he tells us
 that none can *come* to him except his *Fa-*
ther draw him, *S. John* vi. 44. And, that
himself would draw all *Men* after him, xii.
 32. And the *ἀντίληψις* the same with the
κατάληψις I spoke of before. And the
ἔνωσις the *Unity* of the *Spirit*. Yet this *νῦς*
ἀνθρώπινος, which could not *presume* to *aspire*
 to this *Divine Commerce*, can be no other
 than a *Creature*. However, in *Comparison*
 of the *lower unreasonable Soul*, he owns it
 for a kind of *God*: ὡσαυτὶ γὰρ θεός ὅτι τῷ
ἀλόγῳ ὁ νῦς, which he proves from *Moses's*
 being made a *God* to *Pharaoh*. Thus there-
 fore *S. Paul's* words are to be understood,
 when, from *Aratus*, he calls us *God's off-*
spring.

spring: And our Saviour, when he applies the Words of the Psalmist, *I have said, ye are Gods*, to these words *ὁὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* John 1. 34, 35. This lower Spirit therefore it is that lusteth against the Flesh, as the Flesh lusteth against the Spirit. And the Spirit that is infused by God into Man, *Zeck. xii.* And the unquenchable Fire in *Wisdom. xv. 11.* where it is mentioned as distinct from the active Soul. Yet both of them infused by breathing. Unless possibly there may be some critical Difference, more than I am yet aware of, between *ἐκπνεῖν* and *ἐμβνεῖν*. Yet *ἐκπνεῖν* is ascribed to the *νεῦμα* here, which *Philo* ascribes to the *ψυχή* (*anima*), and seems to make it signify the same thing, with *ἐκπνεῖν* and *ἐμβνεῖν*. *Τὰ πνεύματα ἐκπνεῖν, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἐμβνεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκπνεῖν.* 2. and much more I know very well, our modern Divines (since the Aristotelian Philosophy, as expounded by the Arabians, has been received as the Standard of the Philosophical Phenomena of Divinity) do not allow these two parts of the Human Soul to be so distinct, as to be separable. They rather make them only distinct Powers of the same Principle. But you should be pleased to remember that in this whole Discourse I make no modern Sentiments my Rule, any farther, than as they agree with the sense of the Primitive Church in the purest times. And I know not

50.
The Primitive Christians suppose this distinction of the Two Souls in Man, as Fundamental, in their Disputes with their cor-
val Heretics.

not how it can be doubted but that Church allowed the distinction. This appeared in the Disputes then raised by the Hereticks, concerning the Human Nature of our Blessed Lord. Especially the Arians and Apollinarists. The one of them thought the Divinity supplied the Office of even the Human Soul. The others granted him to have a Soul consubstantial to ours; but pretended however that the Divinity supplied, at least, the Office of the Human *Λόγος*, or N^{rs}. Nor do the Catholicks, in their Disputes against them both, deny the distinction; but assert each of them to him, as essential to the true Human Nature, without each of which he could not have been *Homou- sial* to us, as to his Human Nature, as he was to his Father, in regard of his Divinity, according to the determination of the Council of Chalcedon. Particularly, the most learned and judicious Bishop Pearson thinks that the Assertion of the Soul of our Lord, against the Apollinarists, was the true reason why the Article of the Descent into Hell, was inserted into the then received Creeds. And indeed with great probability. Which shews that the Church then took it for more than a disputable Opinion. Such they did not insert in Creeds, but only such Doctrines which themselves, at least, believed Fundamental. But both these parts of the Soul were supposed in this Article of the

the descent into *Hell*. For it could not be meant of his *Divinity*, (which being *omni-present*) neither can *ascend* nor *descend*. And it was his *Soul* which the *Psalmist* foretold as *not left in Hell*. And 'Aðns is the *Hell* there spoken of, which is the common receptacle of *Souls*, both *good* and *bad*, in the state of *separation*. But the *Choical Soul*, could not survive the *Body* without the *breath* of *Life*, which preserves it from *extinguishing*, when the *Body* is made incapable of being acted by it. Its *Union* with the νῆς or πνεῦμα is that *alone* which can then continue its *Being*, so long as the νῆς or πνεῦμα continues in its *own Being*. This therefore *alone* makes it capable of coming into 'Aðns, which is a *state*, not of *Non-existence*, but of *Invisibility* only. The *Gnosticks* therefore, in *S. Irenæus*, who believed these *Two Souls*, not only *separable*, but *actually separated*; accordingly thought there were *Choical Men* who had the *lower Soul* without the πνοή ζωῆς, who had no portion in the *separate State*, as *perishing* together with the *Body*; and that the *Psychical Men*, who had the Νῆς as well as the ψυχῆ, could pretend no higher than the *Status Medietatis*, being excluded from the *Pleroma*, the *Seat* of those *Beings* which were properly *Immortal*. So *S. Athanasius*, against the *Apollinarists*, proves it necessary

ry that our *Saviour* should assume the *upper* as well as the *lower Soul*, if he designed a compleat Salvation of our *whole Man*. Thus therefore it plainly appears, that in the *Opinions* of those *Times*, these *Two Souls* were distinguished from each other; and much more from the *Divine Spirit* received in *Baptism*, which was the Principle of proper *Immortality*. As much as the *Divinity* of our *Saviour* was distinguished from these *two lower* degrees derived from *Adam* as he was a *living Soul*. For the *Baptismal Spirit*, makes us *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, as far as we are capable of being so. Because the *Divine Spirit*, the *Third Person* in the *Trinity*, is the *Spirit of Christ*, in whose *Humanity* the *Fulness* of that *Spirit* is said to dwell, being *anointed* with this *Oil of Gladness* above his *Brethren*. Of this *Fulness* all *Members* of his are said to *receive*, and *Grace for Grace*. That is, so as that none has *all* as he has, and none has *any* but what he *receives* from *him*, and that each *Individual Member* has some wherein he *resembles* him, so far, at least, as to what he has *received* from *him*. This makes us *one Spirit*, as well as the *Water-Baptism* makes us *one Body* with him, which is the *chief*, and most *beneficial Mystical Union* with *Him*.

The

51.
They also
suppose the
Reason-
able Soul
itself, to
be a deri-
vation
from
Christ, as
the Λόγος

The Arche-ypal Ideal Man, the *ἀρχαῖος*, the Man from Heaven, to whom the Dominion over the Creatures is ascribed, and which is truly the immortalizing Principle, is ascribed to our Saviour, in 1 Cor. xv and Heb. ii. Perfectly agreeably to the Platonists, who thought all the *Idea*, and therefore the *αὐτοάνδρον*, among the rest, to be in the *Λόγος*. This seems indeed to be the same with the Divine Spirit, the Third Person of the Trinity, as it is in the disposal of our Lord as the Spirit of Christ. And with this Adam had been united if he had not fallen. And this was God's designing him to be Immortal, that God was pleased, by his good use of the *πνοή* to put this Union with that *πνεῦμα* in his Power, by which he intended to immortalize him. But that was lost by the Fall, and it was the design of the Incarnation to restore it by our Christian Baptism. Yet it is not so completely lost, but that we still retain some glimmerings of even that Divine Light in our rational Souls, as far as a mortal Creature is capable of retaining it. So Tatian concerning the fallen Soul; Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ταύτην ἐπέδαι μὴ βελομένην αὐτῷ κατὰ λόγον πεν. Ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ ἔναυσμα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτῆς κεκτημένη, καὶ διὰ τὴν χρεασμὸν τὰ τίλεια κατὰ δύναμιν μὴ δυναμένη, &c. This *ἔναυσμα* is the *φῶς κυρίου*, in the Proverbs. And Tatian himself ascribes an affinity to it with the Spirit

Spirit which has deserted it. So he tells us concerning good Souls ; αἱ μὲν πειθομένης σοφίας, σφίσι δὲ αὐταῖς ἐφείλκοντο πνεῦμα συγγενές. And S. Paul seconds him in it, when he owns even *Gentile Souls* (who had lost the πνεῦμα by *Adam's Fall*, and had not recovered it by our *Saviour's Baptism*) to be of the γένος of God. This could be meant of nothing but the νοῦς, the *Rational Soul*, as I have already observed. Reason therefore is taken for *Divine*, and as sufficient to entitle to the name of God in the lower sense, as I have already shewn, from *Philo* and our *Saviour* himself. But I should not so much regard *Tatian* in this matter if he had not the Suffrages of better Authorities. His Master S. *Justin* owns an ἐμφύτον παντί *Apolog. i. γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τῷ λόγῳ*. *Semen* is frequently used in this sense by the *Gnosticks*, in *Irenæus*, for this immortal Principle of the *Spirit* derived from their *Æons* and *Pleroma*. And by S. *John* himself 1 *Ep. iii. 9.* where the phrases of having the *Seed*, and being born of God are used *Synonymously*. And S. *Justin* there opposes this σπέρμα τῷ λόγῳ *Ib. ii. p. 83.* to the λόγῳ τῷ παντός, which he says is *Christ*. This therefore can be no other than the ἵνασμα of his Disciple *Tatian*. In his second *Apology* (which is really the former in time) he is more express. He there calls our Blessed Lord πρῶτότοκον τῷ Θεῷ, and λόγον, ὃ πάντων γένος

ἀνθρώπων μετέχε. And then subjoyns: καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγον βιώσαντες, χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν· οἷον ὅτι Ἑλλήσι μὲν Σοκράτης καὶ Ἡρακλείτης, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, &c. He had mentioned *Heraclitus* in his other *Apolo-*logy with reference to this place, ὡς περὶ φημὶ· which, by the way, is another Argument, that the second was truly the former in order of time. His examples are of *Heathens*, who could have no other *Communication* with *Christ*, but by this *supreme* part of their *Rational Souls*. Yet this he thinks sufficient to entitle them to the name of *Christians*, for living by that λόγῳ, which was derived from the *Αὐτολόγος*, that I may speak in the Language of the *Platonists*. And he repeats it again afterwards: Οἱ ὃ μετὰ λόγον βιώσαντες, καὶ βιωῦντες, χριστιανοί. The affinity of the λόγος in our Souls, and the *Fontal* λόγος; and the natural dependence on it as a λόγος, and the small and obscure remainder of the Image of God, which was lost by the fall of Mankind, will give an easie and clear account of these things (according to the *Platonick Hypothesis*) which have been so censured as trifling, sporting upon words, by Persons, otherwise very learned, but not so particularly versed in that Philosophy so frequently alluded to in the *Scriptures*, as well as the earliest *Fathers*.

But

But for the clearer explication of the difference between the *Spirit in us*, as the supreme constituent of our *Human Nature*, and the *Divine Spirit* which we receive from *Christ*, as the Principles that raises and ennobles and immortalizes us; it will not be amiss to observe that the *Spirit* which overshadowed the Blessed *Virgin* at our *Saviour's Incarnation* was the *Third*, not the *Second* Person of the *Trinity*. Our *Creed* obliges us to own this, which professes that our *Lord* was conceived by the *Holy Ghost*. Thence the Blessed *Virgin* is said to be *κεχαριτωμενη*, in being overshadowed by it, which is itself the *χαρις*, and the Original of all the *χαριτες* and *χαρισματα* that are distributed among *Men*. Thence our Blessed *Lord* himself has the title of *Christ* or *Messias*, from this *Archetypical Unction*, which cannot agree to his *Divine*, but his *Humane*, Nature. His *Divine Nature* neither needs, nor is capable of, any farther *Sanctification*. But it is his *Human Nature*, that is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows. It is this, in which it has pleased the *Father* that all fulness should dwell. That is the *Fulness* of the *Spirit*, as opposed to the *Grace* for *Grace* by us received from him. It is in this that the *Fulness* of the *Godhead* is said to dwell bodily. Not as if it felt had any thing of a *Body*, but in opposition to the shadows of the *Law*, mentioned in the *Epistle*

52.
Our Saviour, as Christ, was anointed in his Human Nature, by the fulness of the Divine Spirit. And, on that account, as well as that of the *Λόγος* he gained a Right of being styled the Son of God.

to the *Hebrews*. So that the meaning is, that the *Divine Spirit* it self dwelt in our *Saviour*, not only by a *Visible Symbol* of the *Spirit*, such as were in the *Schechinahs* that overshadowed the *Mercy seat*, or the *Clouds* of the *Tabernacle*, or the *Temple*, in the time of the *Law*. The Word therefore implies the *Original Spirit*, the *αὐτόχρημα* (to use the Phrase of the *Platonists*) in opposition to *sensible Representations* of it. Yet this *Spirit* is the ground why our *Saviour* is called the *Son of God*. So the *Evangelists* expressly: *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God*, S. *Luk.* i. 35. This cannot be understood of the *Filiation* of the *Λόγος*, which is *eternal*. It must therefore be understood of another, that is only *temporary*; that is, of the *Man Christ Jesus*, as he is elsewhere called. Whereby the *Man* is the *Son of God*, and whereby he is the *first born* among many *Brethren*; that is, among many other *Men* who are *Sons of God* as well as he? They could not otherwise be called his *Brethren*. Nor is he called a *Son* on account of the *Miraculous* and *Extraordinary* manner of his *Humane Generation*, as the *Socinians* would have it, who are, by no means competent Judges of these matters, whilst they neglect *coæval Authors* for the signification of terms
of

of Art. God is the God of the Spirits of all Flesh, Numb. xvi. 22. This makes all who partake of the Spirit of Christ, to have one God with him, as our Saviour himself speaks. And in this regard, the Father is the God as well as the Father of our Lord. And he is the Father of Lights, S. Jam. i. 17. Of this particularly which we receive in Baptism, from whence our Saviour's Baptism is itself called Illumination. This makes his Father our Father also. So Homer calls the Supreme Being *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* And Kings particularly he calls *Διὸς Πατὴρ*, as having the Divine Extraction on account of the Spirit of Government. Virgil indeed scruples it concerning Man. His appellation is, *Divum pater, atq; hominum Rex*. Wherein he imitated his Roman Predecessor Ennius. But concerning the Gods, the Greek and the Latin Poets agree. So he is *Pater optimus Divum*, in Lucilius, and *Magnus Pater Divum* in Persius, and *Rektorq; Paterq;* in Ovid, *Metam. ix.* which would have obliged them to follow the same form of Speech for such Men also, as they had believed to have been Partakers of the Divine Nature, which is the case of the whole new *Peculium*. But it cuts off all pretences to God as a Father, from those Men who have no more than the essential Ingredients of the Human Nature, which is the highest claim of the rest of Mankind. That glim-

mering light that still remains in the Soul since the *Fall*, is not alone sufficient for it. It is *preternatural*, and *supernatural*. And it is not so *fixt*, as to continue the Soul in its Being beyond the *Resurrection*, or, at least, the *Conflagration*, which is to follow the day of Judgment.

53.
That same
Spirit be-
ing the
Seed of the
Father, but
derived to
us by our
Saviour,
will make
us the Sons
of God,
and Bre-
thren of
our Savi-
our.

This *Divine Spirit* is, as I said, called a *Seed*, not only in the *Philosophical Traditions* of the *Gnosticks*, but also in the *Scripture*. And it is the *Son* of the *Father*, from whom it is said ἐκπορεύεται, *S. John* xv. 26. A word very properly applicable to *Seed*, It must therefore entitle them who have it to the *first Person* in the *Trinity* as their *Father*, not the *second*. And the *Human Nature*, deriving its *Divine Extraction* from the same *Spirit*, could therefore give the *Divine Person*, on that account, no *higher* a Relation to the *Members* of the *Peculium* than that of a *Brother*. If ἐκπορεύεται have relation to the notion of a *Seed*, it will determine the Question concerning the ἐκπόρευσις of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son*, in in favour of the *Greeks*. For none pretends that the *Holy Ghost* did, in *this* sense, proceed from the *Son*, so as to make the *Son* his *Father*, Περβάλλειν is the word generally used by the *Gnosticks* in *Irenæus*, which the *Latin Interpreter* renders *emit-tere*, when they speak of the *Active* production of their *Æons*, to which ἐκπορεύεται would

would answer conveniently enough, on the part of the Being so produced. But this only by the way. However it is certain that our *Filiation* is derived from our *Participation* of this *Divine Spirit*. This is the *Spirit of Adoption*, by which we are qualified to cry *Abba Father*. This is the *Divine Nature* mentioned by *S. Peter*. This is the *Image of him who is the Image of the invisible God*. As *Adam* is said to be made *after God's Image*, and to *beget a Son after his own Image*. This is the *Spirit* which we receive in our *Christian Baptism*, which is the *Laver of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*; wherein we are *born again*, not of *Water* only, but also of the *Spirit*; wherein we are *born*, not of *Blood*, nor of the will of the *Flesh*, nor of the will of *Man*, but of *God*, wherein we receive power to be called *Sons of God*, wherein we have that *Spirit renewed in us*, which we lost by *Adam*: which is the new *Χριστος* restoring the old *Χριστος* with which *Adam* was created. Thus therefore, by this *Participation* of the *Spirit of Christ*, we became related to his *Humanity*, as anointed with this *Oyl of gladness* above his *Fellows*. And as he is the *Λόγος* also. So the *Platonists* took him for the *Treasury* of all the *Ideæ*, and, among others, of that of the *Archetypal Man*, the *αὐτοάνθρωπος* or *ἄνθρωπος ὑπάρχων*.

And the *νεῦμα* of Nūs was lodged in the Sun, the *Archetypical Intellectual Sun*, which was the same with them as the *Divine λόγος*. So the *πνεῦμα* is the same with Christ, and the Lord from Heaven, in the Reasoning of S. Paul. And their Names are used promiscuously. The Seed of the Spirit is called the *incorruptible Seed of the word of God, which lives and abides for ever*, 1 S. Pet. i. 23. And the word of God which is in us, 1 S. Joh. i. 10. and which abides in us, 1 S. Joh. ii. 14. And Christ in us, the hope of glory, Col. i. 17. By this we understand the occasion of the mistake of several of the earliest *Latin Fathers* especially, who *consonded* these two Titles of our Saviour to the Appellation of God; the one, that of his Person, as *λόγος*, and the second Person of the Trinity: the other, as even his *Human Nature* was consecrated by the *Fulness* of the *Divine Spirit*, the third Person of the same Trinity; which is a *Divine Nature* in the highest sence, and entitled him to the name of God in the same sence, as possessing it in its *Fulness*, as the *Fountain* of it; not only in its *derivative* Gifts and Graces, which was sufficient for the name of a God in the lower and popular Sence then received.

54.
The Spirit's abiding in us
is a Prerogative of the Gospel.

This term of *Abiding*, seems to have been chosen by the *Holy Ghost* to express

the

the peculiar way of the Spirit's residing in us about that which the *Antients*, who lived before the Incarnation, could pretend to. So it is observed concerning the Descent of the *Holy Ghost* upon our Saviour himself, at his *Baptism*, by S. John the Baptist; *ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν*, S. John i. 32. *μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν*, v. 33. And S. Mark i. 10. in the vulgar. So the Father is said *μένειν* in the Son, S. John xiv. 10. And the *Holy Ghost*, the *Paraclete*, *μένειν* with us, and in us, and that for ever, v. 16, 17. And the Father and the Son are said *μὀνὴν ποιεῖν* with us, v. 23. And the Seed of God is said *μένειν* in him, who is begotten of God, 1 S. John iii. 9. which Seed is the Spirit of Adoption, by which we are made Sons, and enabled to cry *Abba Father*. The same Expression is used concerning God the Father singly, 1 S. John iv. 12, 15, 16. And concerning the Son also. Which yet is known by his Spirit; *ἐν τῷ ῥήματι γινώσκουμεν ὅτι μένει ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ἃ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν*, S. John iii. 24. Thus we see that this Expression is used concerning all the three Persons of the Trinity, as far as they are pleased to admit us to the mystical *ἑνωσις* and *κοινωνία* with themselves, which is the peculiar Prerogative of the Gospel-Dispensation, and the new Peculium. And it certainly signifies much more than any Expression used concerning the Influence of the

the *Holy Spirit* on the *antient* Prophets before the *Resurrection*, which is the *Epocha* of giving the *Spirit* by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*. Even then the *Spirit* is said to have *come* upon them, to have *fallen* upon them, to have *rushed* upon them, and that *mightily*. But its *abiding* on any, seems to have been referred for our *Saviour's Triumph*, as a singular Recommendation of his *munificence* on this *Occasion*. What then can be meant by its *abiding* in us? Certainly a more *lasting* Possession of us, than was imported by any of those Expressions used concerning the *Inspirations* mentioned in the *Old Testament*. And indeed their *Inspirations* were very short of ours under the *Gospel* in this particular also. *Balaam* had true *Inspirations*, who neither was of the *chosen People*, nor a good and well disposed Man, fit for receiving the *Prophetick Spirit*. So also *Saul*, though of the true *Peculium*, yet after the *Spirit* of God had departed from him, and after he was abandoned by God, and exposed to the *Insults* of an *Evil Spirit*, then certainly unworthy of the good *Spirit*. Yet he also prophesied when, in pursuit of *David*, he came among the *Prophets*, under the Presidency of *Samuel*. Neither of these Motives could have been any more than what the *Schoolmen* call *Prophetick Instincts*, which required no *Purity* of the *Recipients*, but might,

as God saw good, have been communicated to very wicked Persons. These were confessedly *Prophets*, no otherwise than occasionally. But there were also *true Prophets*, who cannot be thought *inspired* with the *Prophetick Spirit* constantly. Such was the old *lying Prophet*, who deceived the *true Prophet*, who was sent to denounce Judgment against the *Altar* erected by *Jeroboam*. Yet even he was made use of for denouncing Judgment against the *better Prophet*, who had been deluded by him on a false Pretence of a *Divine Inspiration*. Such were all the *true Prophets* of *Ahab's Kingdom of Israel*, excepting *Micaiah*, when God permitted them all to be themselves deceived by a *lying Spirit*. Nor could any of them all prophesie when themselves pleased. The *High-Priest* himself could not pretend to it, without his Oracle of *Urim*, or the *Water of Jealousie*, or such other instituted Means for receiving the Influences of the *Spirit*. Nor could any of the *Prophets* exercise it, but as they were stirred up by the *Spirit* itself. Accordingly these extraordinary Afflations were either given, or denied, as God was pleased to favour or punish the *Publick*, for whose Use these Gifts of the *Spirit* were designed, which were given then. Therefore *Saul* could have no Responses at all by any of the Means then allowed for giving *Divine Oracles*. No,
not

not even in the Case of *Jonathan*, when he had *ignorantly* incurred his Father's *Imprecation*. And the *failing* of the *Prophetick Spirit*, is taken for one of the most disconsoling Circumstances of the Condition of the *old Peculium*, after their *return* from the *Babylonish Captivity*. Nor could any *personal Piety* secure the *Continuance* of those *Gifts* of the *Spirit* then, which were *not* given as the Rewards of *Personal Piety*, but for the use of *others*, rather than of the *Persons* who were *favoured* with them. The *Spirit of Prayer and Supplication* then mentioned, was an *Excitation* to *Prayers* for their *temporal Deliverances* from *Publick Calamities*. It was a *Token* that *God* would *hear* such *Prayers* for the *Publick*, when he was pleased, by his *Spirit*, to raise a *zealous* and *ardent* Concern for the *Publick*, in *Persons* eminently *Pious*, which might *vent* itself in *Prayers* for the *Publick*; though *otherwise* the Case might sometimes fall out, that even *servent Prayers* might not be available for the removal of *temporal Calamities* of the *common Body*. But the *abiding* of the *Spirit* in us, which is *proper* to the *Gospel*, relates to the *Good* of the *Soul* of him who is so happy as to be *entitled* to it, and depends not on the *Behaviour* of *others*, if he, who has it, be not *wanting* to *himself* in qualifying himself for its *Continuance*. And therefore it is as *lasting* as the *Person*

is true to the *Disposition* required on *his* part, which the *Scripture* calls *abiding in God* and *Christ*, and in the *Truth*, and in the *Unity of the Spirit*, in order to the securing the *Benefits* of the *Cælestial Mystical Communion*. This is that which the *Old Testament* never pretends as a *Benefit* of that *old Dispensation*. But, where-ever it speaks of it, it is only by way of *Prediction*, of what should be performed in the *latter Days*, by which it always understands the times of the *Gospel*, according to the *Interpretation* of the *Apostles*, and the *other Writers* of the *New Testament*. *Μένειν* therefore implies such an *abiding* of the *Spirit* in *us*, as agrees to an *Inhabitant*, not to a *Stranger* or a *Traveller*, who designs *no long stay*. So the *Disciples* meant in their question to our Saviour, *Πό μόνεις*; *Where dwellest thou*? They desired to know the place of his *fixt* abode, *S. Job. i. 39*. So the *μένυσα πόλις*, *Ebr. iii. 14*. is opposed to the *uncertainty* of the *abode* of *Strangers* and *Pilgrims*. Such as that was of the *Israelites* in their passage from *Egypt* to *Canaan*. And such as we are all supposed to be in while we are in *this World*, our *Mystical Egypt*, where we are *Sojourners* in our *Mystical Canaan*, our *Heavenly Countrey*. So the *Son of Sirach* makes *Wisdom*, after her *Travels* through *all Nations*, to *fix* her *Habitation* in *Israel*, *Eccl. xxiv. 13*. But this seems only to have related
to

to her Government of that Nation as a Theocracy, not to her dwelling in their Persons, and qualifying them for Supernatural Benefits. The Hellenists then seem to have had no Notion of the Inhabitation of the Spirit in us, as in Temples. And the Apostolical Writers refer the Passages of the Old Testament Prophecies, which intimate it to the State of the Gospel. So S. Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 16. So also his Colleague Apostle of the Gentiles, Barnabas in his Catholick Epistle, c. 16. Yet Seneca, Ep. 41. and Hierocles on the Golden Verses, mention the like Habitation of a Divine Spirit in Men, as attainable by Philosophy, which Clemens Alexandrinus also mentions, and allows it. This was singular and proper to the new Peculium. But much more so, that every particular Christian should thus receive the Spirit by the same Baptism, that initiated him into the Privileges of the Christian Society. That all should thus be new taught of God immediately; by the God that made him his Temple, by the Unction, from whence he received the Name of Christian, a Derivation from that which gave our Lord the Title of Christ or Messias, on which account we are not only Christians, but anointed, or Christs, in the Language of the Psalmist. It is therefore a fixt Habitation of the Spirit, that is signified by this Word μένειν, or abiding, in the New Testament.

stament; not single and occasional Inflations
 of it, such as those were, which were, for
 some time, common under the old Dispensa-
 tion. Not only so: The same Word, as it
 is used in Scripture, signifies an *Eternal*
Abode, and is therefore very proper for de-
 noting a *Principle of Immortality*. So the
 words *for ever*, are frequently joined with
 it, *Pf. xxxiii. 11. lxxxix. 36. cxi. 3. 10.*
cxii. 3. 9. cxvii. 2. Is. xl. 8. S. John xii. 34.
Ebr. vii. 3. 24. And, even when those
 Words are not added, yet the Word μένειν
 implies them. So the κρείττων ὑπαρξίς ὑπανοῖς
 καὶ μένουσα, *Ebr. x. 34.* And the μένουσα πό-
 λις ἢ μέλλουσα, *Ebr. xiii. 14.* Both places
 speak of the *Cælestial Archetypes*, which are
 always, in this *Platonical Reasoning* of the
New Testament, supposed *Eternal*. So the
 βρώσις μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, *S. John vi. 27.*
 It seems opposed to the Word παράγειν used
 concerning the *Enjoyments of this World*, to
 shew how *uncertain* they are and *transitory*.
 So, παράγει τὸ χῆμα τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, *1 Cor.*
vii. 31. Ἡσυχία παράγεται, *1 S. John ii. 8.* Ὁ
 κόσμος παράγεται, *v. 17.* Yet even the Words
 εἰς αἰῶνα are added on this very Occasion
 of speaking of the *Spirit*. Our Saviour
 promises to pray the *Father* to give the Spi-
 rit, ἵνα μένη μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *S. Joh. xiv.*
16. And we are said to be *born again*, not
 of *corruptible Seed*, but of *incorruptible*, διὰ
 λόγον ζωῆτος θεοῦ, καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *1 S.*
Pet.

Pet. i. 23. This *Seed*, by which we are *born again*, is no other than the *Baptismal Spirit*. This is the *Seed* which *abides* in us, 1 *S. John* iii. 9. And the *Life* to which we are here *begotten*, is called a ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν αὐτῷ μένουσα, 1 *S. John* iii. 15. And the *Sonship* to which this *Spirit* of *Adoption* entitles us, gives us a *Right* to *abide*, μένειν, in *God's House*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *S. John* viii. 35. And the same form of *Speech* is made use of concerning the *Punishment* of the *Breach* of our *Baptismal Covenant*: Ἡ ὁπρὶν τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτὸν, *S. John* iii. 36. Ἡ ἀμαρτία ὑμῶν μένει, ix. 41. where *Sin* is taken for the *Punishment* of *Sin*, as when it is said, *your Iniquity shall find you out*. So μένει ἐν θανάτῳ, 1 *S. John* iii. 14. by which we may easily gather, that this is to be *Eternal* also: So that *both States* are *immortalized* by this *Divine Spirit*, which had not been so without it.

55. Indeed its entitling us to *Heaven*, sufficiently shews it to be a *distinct Principle* from our *Human Souls*; even from that part of them which was from the *Divine Breath*. The place for *separate Souls*, is the *Air*, not *Heaven*, any otherwise than as the *Air* has the Name of *Heaven* also, and as the *Heaven* of the *Blessed* is called the *Heaven* of *Heavens*, by way of *Contradistinction* from this *lower Heaven*. That is really *Adns* the *Receptacle* of good, as well

The same Distinction appears in this, that the Air is the proper Abode for separate Souls; but Heaven is the proper Abode of the Spirit.

well as *wicked Souls*, till the *Resurrection*, according to the *Antients*. So *Origen* understood the Passage of *S. John*; *The sea gave up the dead which were in it: and death and hell delivered up the dead that were in them*, *Rev. xx. 13.* *Ut ego puto, mare hic pro humido omni appellatum est elemento, infernus autem pro aere, mors verò pro terrâ.* His Words are from *Pamphilus* the Martyr, in his *Apology* for him, out of his Work *de Resurrectione*. The Word used by the Sacred Writers for *Hell*, or *Infernus*, is *Adns*, and it agrees very well with his Design, that when the *Grave*, which is meant by *Death*, gave up the *Bodies* as well as the *Sea*, *Adns* also should give up the *Souls* there deposited, in order to their *Re-union* at the *Resurrection*. This is paraphrased by the Apocryphal *Esdra*s, in these Words: *The Earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the Dust those that dwell in silence, and the secret Places shall deliver those Souls that were committed unto them*, *2 Esd. vii. 32.* This Author might have had this place of the *Revelations* in view when he wrote this, as he seems to have had several other Passages of that same mysterious Book in *other* places. And he lived in so near Memory of *S. John*, that he might very well know how the *Christians* of that *Age* understood him, for whose use the *Holy Ghost* designed it. He is certainly

R ly

ly not only elder than S. Ambrose, who quotes this very Passage from him, *de Bon. Mort. c. 10.* than Origen himself, who very probably took what he has here from him; but than even Origen's Master, Clemens Alexandrinus, who quotes this Book, though not this Passage. *Promptuaria* is the Word in our present Translation, but in S. Ambrose it is *Habitacula*; perhaps οἰκητήρια in the Greek, as will appear hereafter. *Habitaculum* is the Term used by the antient Author, *de tribus habitaculis*, by whom it appears to have been in the middle, between Heaven and Hell, and distinct from both of them. Like the Gnostick *status medietatis*, distinct from the *Pleroma*, as well as this lower World, and by them allotted for such Souls, as were not of the spiritual Seed. So strange an Agreement there is among all the Primitive Christians, Hereticks as well as Catholicks, in this Matter. The Fathers are so agreed in it, that our most learned Bishop Pearson has expounded the Article of the Descent into Hell, of the Descent of our Saviour's Soul into this common Custody of Souls, as Lactantius calls it, that his Death might be every way like ours; that his Soul might, upon its Dissolution from the Body, go to the common Receptacle of Souls, as his Body did to the Grave, which is to receive all our Bodies. That was a Point which was then believed of greater Consequence,

Abp. Usher
against
Mat. of
Limb.
Patr. p.
255. Ed.
Lond.
1686.

quence, than we may think it now. The Scandal of the *Cross* made the *Hereticks* of those times generally, as well as the *Gentile Infidels*, unwilling to believe that the *Supreme Being* could condescend so far as to die like us. However, that this is the place for *separate Souls*, and that none, or very few of them, go to the places of their ultimate Reward or Punishment, till the day of Judgment, the first Antients were generally agreed, and the *Greeks* to this very day, and many late, as well as great, Authorities even among the *Latines* themselves. Such were *S. Bernard*, and Pope *John XXII.* such, even of the *Romish* Communion, *Mr. White*, *de medio Animarum statu*, to name no more. And, in our own Church, my great and honoured Patron, Bishop *Taylor*, and the very learned and judicious *Mr. Thorndike*. And that this middle space is *Ἄδης*, appears from *Homer*, the first Author of that *λέξις* that we know of. He places *Tartarus*,

Τόπον ἐνερθ' αἰδέω ὅσον ἱερὰνός ἐς ἀπὸ
γαίης.

He plainly divides the *Subcælestial World* into two Spaces: The one from *Heaven* to our *Earth*, which he calls *Ἄδης*; the other from the *Earth* downwards, which was his *Tartarus*. So *Hesiod* understood him,

when he repeated his Words: Only with this Difference; that, instead of *ἐνερῶ αἰ. δέω*, he thought fitter to express it *ἐνερῶ ὑπὸ γῆς*, by which it appears more plainly, that he took our *Earth* for the *lowest* Bound of *Ἄδης*. So *Lucretius*, L. IV. also;

*Despectum præbet sub terras impete tanto,
A terris quantum, cæli pater altus hiatus.*

He there alludes to *Homer's* Words, tho' he does not use them concerning the same thing. Yet his *Allusion* to the Words is sufficient for my Purpose, to shew that the *Earth* was taken for the *Bound* of *Homer's* *Ἄδης*. So *Virgil* also, *Æneid* VI.

*Tum Tartarus ipse
Bis patet in præceps, tantum tenditque sub
umbras,
Quantus ad æthereum, cæli suspectus Olym-
pum.*

The Phrase, *ire sub umbras* with him, answers that of *Homer*, αἶδος δὲ βέλους. By which it appears, that *Ἄδης* is the same with *him* as the place of the *umbræ*, by which he means the *separate Souls*, as invested with those *subtil Bodies*, which gave them a *Shape*, and a *Capacity* of appearing to our *Senses*, and of suffering *Corporeal Impressions*, according to the

An-

Antients. These are *Homer's* ψυχῶν εἰδωλα θανόντων. This therefore can be no other than the *Air*. Accordingly *Vettius Valens Antiochenus* makes that the place of *separate Souls*, and proves it by the Testimony of the *Orphick* and other *Oracles*, which were of great *Authority* with the *Philosophers* of these *lower Ages*. MS. Oxon. Seld. olim. Chr. Longolis. p. 253.

His words are these, Πελαγοδρομήσας ἔν, καὶ πολλῶν γλῶθ διοδύσας, κλιμάτων τε καὶ ἔθνων κατόπτης γεγόμενος. πολυχρονία πέρα καὶ πόνοις συνεμφερὴς ἡξιώθην ὑπὸ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ περνοῖας βεβαίως καὶ ἀσφαλῶς λιμήνῃ τύχην. Οὐ γὰρ φθαρτὰ πάντα καὶ μοχθηρὰ ἔλαχον οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Ἐστὶ δέ τι καὶ θεῖον ὃν ὑμῖν θεόπνευστον δημιοργημα. Ὅγε περικεχυμένον ἀφθαρτῶν ὑπάρχων καὶ διήκων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπόρροϊαν καιρικῶν ἀθανασίας ἀπονέμει τακτῶ καὶ μεμειρημένῳ χρόνῳ. Ὡς ἕκαστος ἡμῶν καθ' ἡμέραν μελέτῃ γυμναζόμενος λαμβάνειν, ἢ καὶ ἀποδιδόναι τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεοτάτος Ὀρφεὺς λέγει. MS. 119 MS.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἐρρίζωται, MS. 1

Καὶ ἄλλως.

Ἄερα δ' ἑλκοντες ψυχῶν θεῖαν δρεπόμεθα. MS. 119

Ἄλλως.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρωσ ἐκ Διὸς ἐστίν.

Ἄλλως.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατος πάντων, τὰ δ' σώματα θνητά.

Ἐνθεν ἔφ' ὅσον ἔχομεν τὴν ψυχὴν, κινούμεθα,
 καὶ ὁμιλοῦμεν, καὶ πελάσομεν, καὶ μηχανώμεθα,
 καὶ ποιῶμεν, ἔργα ἰσόθεα. Ὅποτε δ' εἰς τὴν
 ἀέρα ἀναδραμῇ τὸ χρέος· περκαίται σῶμα
 νεκρὸν ἀναυδόν, κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἑτέραν τὸ πνεύ-
 μα [μὴ I think should be added for the
 sense] συγκεχωρηκός, κενὸν εἰμαρμένης, in
 opposition to the θεῖον δημιουργημα θεο-
 πνεύσον, when it had the Spirit from the
 Air. δημιουργημα. [θεῶν alluding to the
 ἔργα ἰσόθεα before mentioned, add,] ἑδένος
 ὃν δελτικόν. Τῆς γὰρ φύσεως [why not rather
 πνεύσεως or φυσήσεως?] ἀναλυθείσης εἰς τὴν
 οἰκείον τόπον ἐλέγχεται τότε τὸ θεῖον σῶμα.
 The Author is not extant, nor is the
 MS. common. Both will recommend the
 giving his words to the curious Reader.
 His beginning is plainly an imitation of
 Critodemus, one of the antientest Writers
 of Judicial Astrology. That Author's words
 Vettius Valens has preserved, as follows:
 Ὁ δὲ σοφώτατος Κριτόδημος ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ
 αὐτοῦ Ὁρασις συνεχλικωτάτη πολλῶν μαρ-
 τυρίων ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην ἐποίησατο. “Ἦδη πότε
 “ πελαγοδρομήσας καὶ πολλὴν ἔρημον διόδους·
 “ ἠξιώθην ὑπὸ θεῶν λιμένος ἀκινδύνῃ τυχεῖν
 “ καὶ μοῆς ἀσφαλεστάτης. By which we un-
 derstand the Pains and Industry both these
 Authors used in accomplishing themselves
 in this superstitious and uncertain Science.
 Which will make them both the more re-
 gardable in their kind. Then it is observ-
 able

able how differently these two *Heathen* Authors speak concerning the *Divinity* owned by them. What *Chritodemus* expresses in the *plural* number ὑπὸ Θεῶν, that *Vettius Valens* mentions in the *singular* number only ὑπὸ Θεῶ, both of them according to the custom of their *Age*. The *Philosophers*, after our Saviour's time, introduced that new Form of Speech, making their Addressee rather to the *Supreme Being* immediately, than to the *Popular Deities*, and by reducing all of them to the *Sun*, in favour of *Alagabalus*, as appears in *Macrobius*. This Work is an *Anthology* collected out of the *eldest* and *best* Authors of the kind, together with his own Observations and Improvements in this Book, to which this *Preface* belongs. This was the way also of *Julius Firmicus*, an Author whose Age is better known. This makes it very difficult to determine the *Collector's Age* from the *Astrological Calculations* mentioned in it, because it is so difficult to distinguish whose the Calculations are, whether of the *Collector*, or of some of the *Authors* out of whom he made his Collection. The latest Note that I have observed, in a cursory view of him, is of the *xxi Year* of *Antoninus Pius*. The *Collector* mentions one Βάλας. If this be the same with *Vettius Valens*, the *Collector* cannot be *Vettius Valens*, but some later Man, who has excerpted *Vet-*

tius as well as others. Whoever he be, he makes the *Air* to be the place of *separate Divine Souls*, and that *part* of the *Air* which has also the Appellation of *Æther*. And he takes this to have been the Sence of the *Divine Orpheus*, whom the *Heathen* thought *inspired*, and reckon for one of their first Θεόλογοι in the, same sence as S. John the Evangelist and S. Gregory Nazianzen, are called also Θεόλογοι, as observing the *Phraseology* of the most antient Derivers of *Tradition*, from the freshest *Memory* of what Mankind had received from the *Divine Revelations*, before the *Divine familiar Conversation* with Mankind was interrupted. From this *Æther* he derives the ριζωμα of *Souls*, as the *Pythagoreans*, in their *Golden Verses*, make the *Elements* the ριζώματα of all sublunary Bodies. So our *Microcosm* is compared to a *Tree* having its *Root* in *Heaven*, and the τελεγκτός is made the παγα ἀενάου φύσεως by the same *Pythagoreans*. So our Author also makes our *Death* to be a payment of a *debt* to that same *Air* from whence we received our *Souls*, ὅποτε εἰς τὴν αἴρα ἀναδραμῇ τὸ χρίος. So *Death* is commonly call'd the τὸ χρίος, as this *Return* of our *Souls* to the *Air* from whence they first came, is, in the Language of the *Scripture*, a *Return* of our *Spirits upwards to God* that made them. It is here called ἀγάλυσις εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον τόπον. Exactly

as in *S. Paul*; ὁ καιρὸς τῆ ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως
 ἐφίετο, 2 *Tim.* iv. 6. τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων
 εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, *Phil.* i.
 23. As our ἐκδήμησις ἐκ τοῦ σώματος is our
 ἐκδήμησις πρὸς τὸ κύριον, 2 *Cor.* v. 8. whom
 we are to meet εἰς τὸ αἶθερ, 1 *Thess.* iv. 17.

So also *Hermes Trismegistus* in *Stobæus*:
 Τὸ ὃ ἀπὸ σελήνης, ὡ τέκνον, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ψυχῶν
 ὅσιν οἰκῆθμεν, which afterwards he calls
Air. This was the *Egyptian Philosophy*
 of those times, which all bore the name of
Hermes, as the *Chaldaic* bore the name of
Zoroastres, and the *Pythagoreans* wrote ma-
 ny of them under the name of their Ma-
 ster *Pythagoras*. And it is manifest, how
 much influence that *Egyptian Hypothesis*
 had, not only on the earliest *Hereticks*, who
 were many of them *Egyptians*, but also on
 the *Catholicks* themselves, as they expressed
 their *Divine Revelation* in the Language of
 the *Hellenists*, who had no where more
 flourishing Colonies than in *Egypt*, and the
Greek parts of Africa, which depended on
 it. Here we have the *Greek Word* exactly
 answering the word *habitaculum* mentioned
 in the antient *Latin Authors* now produced.
 This therefore is the Ἄδης which contains
 both sorts of Souls in it till the day of
Judgment, the *Bad* as well as the *Good*. Ac-
 cordingly it has sometimes the name of
Heaven, sometimes of *Hell*, which has oc-
 casioned considerable mistakes in the lower
 Fa-

Father who did not observe it. Especially *S. Augustine*, who rather pleased himself in Reasoning from received Opinions, than in consulting Originals. It was the lower Heaven, as partaking of *Light*; and the uppermost Hell as partaking of that *Darkness* which is the *Characteristick* of those Regions which we call *Infernal*. This Distinction of both States is commonly owned by the Writers of that Age, Sacred and Prophane, as well as by the modern *Rabbins*. And the *Revolutions* of Night and Day were sufficient to make them believe the Air inhabited both by good and bad Spirits, according to the Reasonings of those Times. For they judged of the *Mystical Light* and *Darkness*, by the *Light* and *Darkness* that was sensible. The Heavens therefore properly so called (having no returns, nor mixture of *Darkness*) they assigned to the pure Spirits, which had no Contagion of Matter or material Affections. And, on the contrary, there being no access of *Light* to the Subterraneous Regions, they were accordingly allotted to the worst of Spirits, that were at the furthest distance and opposition to the *Mystical Light*. It was therefore agreeable, That the middle space between both, having its *Vicissitudes* of the sensible *Light* and *Darkness*, should be possessed by suitable Inhabitants of both sorts, but neither of them so absolute in their hands as those were who

who were lodged in the *pure Light* and the *unmixed Darknefs*. Yet, though both sorts be in the same *Space*, they were supposed to have different *Residences*, and in different *Bodies*, so as to have no *Communication* with each other. That is plainly implied in the great *Gulph* fixed between them, mentioned in the Parable of the *Rich Man* and *Lazarus*, and where the *Apostle* denies all *κοινωνία* between *Light* and *Darkness*. Meaning such as he supposes between the *Members* of those different *Bodies* respectively, and among themselves. And indeed the *Grosness* of their *Vehicles* was sufficient to cause that *Distinction* of their situation, according to that *Philosophy* which is alluded to by the *Sacred Writers* of the *New Testament*. That *Grosness* was occasioned by their *Aversion* to *Heavenly* things in this *Life*, and their having preferred *Material* Enjoyment before them. Accordingly they who had most immersed themselves in *Corporeal* Pleasures, contracted thereby the heaviest grossest *Vehicles*, which naturally depressed them to the lower Places, in proportion to their *Earthly* inclinations here; which did withal possess them with the most *vitious Habits*, and the most *devilish Delights* in doing *Mischief*, and the most *devilish Aversation* to the *Society* of those who were better and most religiously disposed. Thus the distance between them would result from

Cl. Windet.
de Vir.
funct. stat.
§. 13.

from the several *Dispositions* of the *lowest happy Soul*, and the *Supreme* of those which were *unhappy*, and the *corporeal Gravity* of their *εἶδωλον* consequent to those *Dispositions*. And there must be the like *distance* among *Souls* of the *same* rank as there was between their *Immerſion* in *Matter*, consequent to the *Habits* contracted by the different use of their *Free-will*, when they were yet in their *Bodies*. However, though there were no *Conversation* between *happy* and *unhappy Souls* : Yet the *Devils* (at least, that *less defiled* part of them which were only excluded from *Heaven*, but suffered to exercise their *Authority*, like *Princes*, in the *darkness* of the *Air*) must consequently have a liberty of *ranging* so far as that *darkness* of the *Air* reached, and so far as the extent of *ὕλη*, of which they were the *Managers* for *mischievous* Purposes. This was indeed as far as the *Moon*, which was taken for the *Grater* of *Souls* designed for *Bodies*. This was the *lowest Orb* of those *Bodies*, which, in an *appropriated* sence, are taken for *Celestial*. And thus far the power of *Evil Spirits* was commonly thought to extend in *Eclipses* of the *Moon*, which were, for some time, ascribed by the *Vulgar*, to the influence of such *Spirits* endeavouring to offer violence to the *Moon*, by the practices of *Witches*, with whom they corresponded. These *Spirits* therefore they

they pretended to *afright* away by *Noises*. And, when they had attained more Skill in *Astronomy*, and knew that the *cause* of that *Darkness* was the *Interception* of the *Sun's Light*, by the *Interposition* of the *Earth* between the *Sun* and the *Moon*; yet that *Darkness* was sufficient, on that *Hypothesis*, to make it reduceable to the *Dominion* of the *Prince of Darkness*. And this is the *Slavery* to *Death* and the *Devil*, to which *Mankind* was condemned by *Adam's Fall*, that, whereas *God* designed *Man* for *Immortality*, by that *Union* with the *Immortalizing Spirit*, which *God* was pleased to put in his *Power* at his first *Creation*; when he had, by his own *Fault*, lost that *Spirit*, he was, from that time, *confined* to that *Region of Mortality*, the *Kingdom of Death*, which was *natural* to him; and thereby made *subject* to him who has the *κράτος* of *Death*, that is, the *Devil*, *Ebr. ii. 14*. His having the *κράτος* of that *Kingdom of Death*, implies him to be the *Prince* of that *ἐμπράτεια*. And so indeed he is, as is the *Prince* of this *World*, of the *Darkness* of it, which is the *Region of Mortality*, relating to the *invisible State*, which is signified by the Word *Ἄδης*. Thus all *Mankind* were made obnoxious to that *Government* which was allowed the *Devil* by *God* himself, after his *Expulsion* from *Heaven*. But no farther than *God* had been pleased to allow

low it him, and with those *Restrictions* which God had reserved, for the Good of those whom he should be pleased to take into his own *Protection*, and the *Guard* of those good *Angels* who officiated under him as *ministring Spirits*, for the good of the *Heirs of Salvation*, *Ebr. i. 14.* This was really a *Right of the Peculium*, as they were a *Theocracy*, under the *immediate Government* of the *Λόγος*, and not committed by him, like other *Nations*, to a *subordinate Government* by *Tutelar Angels*. And this was such a *Curb* to the *καταπραΐσις* as confined their Power over such Souls to very narrow Bounds, even whilst the Souls themselves were, by the *Grossness* of their *shady Bodies*, confined within those *Jurisdications*, wherein they were allowed an *Exercise of Power* by the *Laws* of their *Creator*. For these *separate Souls* are said to be with the *Lord*, to return to him that gave them; and so, that no *Torment* can touch them. So the *Hellenists*, *Wisd. iii. 1.* and every way agreeably to the *inspired Writings*. The *Protection* is certainly greater there than in this *World*, as God and good *Spirits* are more present there, and as the *Power* of the *God* of this *World* must needs be greater, where the *Matter* is grosser and more impure. Yet, even here, the *Devil* himself gives this account of *God's Providence* over *Job*: *Hast thou not made a hedge about him, and about his*

his house, and about all that he hath on every side? *Job* i. 10. I know not therefore, wherein this *Slavery* of these separate happy Souls to the Devil could consist, unless possibly, in obliging them to appear here below, against their own Wills, in Compliance with those *Laws* of Providence, which suffered it, for Reasons concerning the good Government of our World, though unknown to us. For *Porphyry*, in *Stobæus*, tells us, that Souls which have passed the *Styx*, forget their Concerns here, but withal retain such an *Aversation* for all their past Acquaintance here, as never to appear to any willingly, nor without the Authority of *Pluto* and *Proserpine* obliging them to do so. That they make to have been the Case of *Alcestis* granted to *Hercules*, and of *Eurydice* to *Orpheus*. Both of them by *Pluto* and *Proserpine*. That Prince of the Darkeness of this Air, is the same with the *Pluto* of the Poets, the Lord of *Adns*. And it could be no other than he that obliged the Soul of *Samuel* to appear and give Responses to *Saul*, on account of the *Necromantick* Adjurations of the *Witch* of *Endor*. That he was forced to do so, appears by his own Words; *why hast thou disquieted me?* which are not the Words of one that came willingly, nor of a good Man coming by the Command of God. Yet the eldest Jews thought it no Disparagement to their Patriarch to believe

Ubi supra.

believe him to have been *real Samuel* that was so *disquieted*. The Son of *Sirach* thought so, *Eccl.* xlv. 23. and reckons it among his Glories, that, even then, he *prophefied*: Nor does *Josephus* intimate the least Doubt of it, where he relates the Story, *Ant.* vi. 15. These are the eldest *Jewish* Authors, next the *Scriptures*, that mention it, of whose *time* we are certain. The *eldest Christian Writer*, who takes notice of it, is *Justin Martyr*; and he is full in the Point, not only concerning *Samuel*, but concerning the *Souls* of all *righteous Men* and *Prophets*: *Ραίνεσθαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἔτιως δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ἐπιπλόν τῶν τοιούτων δυνάμεων, ὅποια δὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐγλατρίμῳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖται.* So *Origen* also (that *Master of the Church* next the *Apostles*, as *S. Jerome* stiles him before his *Quarrels* concerning him.) in a just Discourse of this Subject, though not so consistently with his Hypothesis of the *natural Immortality of Human Souls*. So also *Anastasius Antiochenus* expressly asserts, that *all the Souls*, as well of the *Saints* as of the *Wicked*, were under the *Power of the Devil*, till they were delivered by *Christ*. And he so expounds the Words of *S. Paul*, that *death* (that is, says he, the *Devil*) *reigned over all from Adam to Moses*. But the Instance of *Samuel* shews, that this Power is *not* to be

Dial. cum
Tryph. p.

Orig. de
Engastrimurho.

Ὁμνυ.
Q. II. 2.

confined to the time of *Moses*. All are supposed by *S. Justin* to be in the same Condition, even since *Christ*. And that he gives, as the Reason of the *Prayers* of the Church for departing Souls, that they might be delivered from the Molestations of these *Evil Angels*, and interprets a Passage of the *Psalmist* to this Purpose. This I believe might be the Occasion of those antient *Liturgies* produced by *Primate Usher*, wherein we find *Prayers* for *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, the *Apostles*, the *Martyrs*, even the *Blessed Virgin* her self, though those *Ages*, wherein those *Liturgies* were introduced, had entertained the highest Opinions of her Happiness, beyond that of any mere Creature. Not only as owning them all as one Body with the *Militant Church* on Earth, but as believing them to need their *Prayers* whilst they were in those separate Mansions accessible by the Devil. This was the Case of those who sinned without a positive Law, such as *Adam* had, and did, in regard of the generality of Mankind, expire with *Moses*; yet it is certain, that the *Kingdom of Death* did not do so. The *Apostle* reckons *Death* as the last Enemy that shall be subdued by our Lord, 1 Cor. xv. 26. not certainly, till the general Resurrection. So long therefore even these good Souls must be some way under him who has the *παρὰ* of that *παρὰ*. I have already shewn, that even the

the *Apostles* were thought to go to *Adms*, by the Apostolical *Hermas*. Yet these are reckon'd in the *Scripture* and the same *Hermas*, as the *Foundations* of the Church, next *Christ* the chief corner Stone, in Allusion to the Passage of the *Psalmist*, on which all the other Members of the Church are to be superstructed. Thence it appears, that even new baptized Persons, and *Martyrs* (whose Case is believed equal to that of those who die in their *Baptismal Purity*) being incorporated into the same Body with the *Apostles*, and built upon them, cannot be exempted from that State, to which the *Apostles* themselves are liable. And, if these be not exempted, I know none others that can pretend to it. Nor can I perceive any Inconvenience in it, so long as this *Slavery* to the Devil does not make them obnoxious to any Pains that can be inflicted by the Devil, but only some *Disquietudes*, wherein they might be relieved by the Prayers of the Living, according to the Opinion of *S. Justin Martyr*. It is certain, that, even in these separate *Receptacles*, these purer Souls are said to be happy, and to be with *Christ*, notwithstanding this *Slavery* to the Devil, whilst they are in these Regions of *Mortality*; and therefore that their *Slavery* cannot make them liable to such Inconveniences, as may be inconsistent with their *Happiness*; nor, that their *Disquietudes* can be

be so great, as to hinder their State from being a State of Rest, as to the main, as the Scripture describes it. But how is it reconcilable, that they can be in *Heaven*, as being with *Christ*; and yet in *Adms*, as not being altogether free from the Power of the Devil? Very well: There is the uppermost and the nethermost Hell or *Gehenna*. And there is the *Heaven*, and the *Heaven of Heavens*, or far above all *Heavens*, in the Language of the Scripture, the *Pleroma*, in the Language of the *Gnosticks*. Both *Heavens* are places of *Happiness*, as both *Hells* are supposed to be in the Power of the Devil. The Difference is this: The lower *Heaven* is the place of the less perfect *Happiness*, as the uppermost *Hell* is the place where the Devil's Power is most restrained, as it must be where it cannot hinder the *Inhabitants* from being happy. And both these Qualifications may agree to the *Air*, in the Bounds now described, as it is a mixture of mystical *Light* and *Darkness*, answerable to those *Vicissitudes* of visible *Light* and *Darkness* here supposed. As all the space between the *Air* and the *Earth* is the Seat of *Mortality*, and not properly *Heaven*; so it is contained under the *Kingdom of Death*, and of him that has the Power of *Death*, as being all *Air*, in Opposition to *Heaven*, properly so called. But as it has *Light*, and, in the places nearest *Heaven*,

more *pure* and *unmixt*, comparatively with what is more *remote* from *Heaven*, and (for that Reason) more *mixt* with *Darkness*; so it has the Name of *Æther*, as contradistinguished from *Air* in a more restrained Sense, and is accordingly capable of that *Happiness* ascribed to it in the *Scripture*. This Distinction is owned by the *Scholiast* on *Homer*, who bears the Name of *Didymus*. He makes *three* Spaces of the

In Homer,
Il. ̸ v. 16. *νεφελῶν, εἶτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινομένων,*
that is, the *starry Heaven*, so called by *Aratus* in his *φαινόμενα*. The *third* therefore

is that of the several *Orbs* of the *starry Heaven* itself. Which therefore was, very probably the *third Heaven*, into which *S. Paul* was caught, of greater Dignity than the *ordinary Heaven* of the *Blessed*, in which they are supposed to be at *present*. This *second Region* therefore seems to be the place of *happy Souls*, till the *Resurrection*. This *S.*

Rev. vi. 9. *John* places ὑποκάτω τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, which he alots even to the *Martyrs* themselves, the *highest Rank* of the *ordinary Blessed*. That *Altar* he calls the *Golden Altar* before the *Throne of God*, *Rev. viii. 3. ix. 3.* No doubt, in Allusion to the *Golden Altar of Incense*, which was in that part of the *Jewish Temple*, which was accessible to none but the *Priests*. Accordingly the *Oblations* offered on it, are θυμιάματα, *Rev. v. 8.* and *Frankincense*,

incense, *Rev. viii. 3, 4.* Plainly relating to the *Archetypal Altar*, and the *Archetypal Ob-lations* offered by the *Archetypal High-Priest* himself in *Heaven*. And *Heaven* is the place which *God* himself, in the *Prophet*, calls his *Throne*, *Is. lxvi. 1.* And so does our *Saviour*, *S. Matth. v. 34. xxiii. 22.* Who can doubt but that this *Altar* before the *Throne of God*, can be no other but that *Archetypal Altar* in *Heaven*. properly so called. The *Martyrs* therefore, which are under that *Altar*, cannot be thought to be in *Heaven* itself. The *Passage* in the *Revelations* itself, supposes them otherwise. They are warned, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled, *Rev. vi. 11.* This ἀνάπαυσις is plainly that which is ascribed to the righteous departed Souls by *Is. liii. 2.* and which is alluded to in *Ebr. iii. 18.* and which is *Heaven*, the *Mystical Canaan*, in Allusion to that of the *Israelites* in the *Earthly Canaan*, into which they were introduced by *Joshua*, the Type of our *Jesus*, *Ebr. iv. 8, 9.* And when this *Rest* is mentioned as likely to last but for a little season, till all their *Fellow-Martyrs* should have suffered also. That must be till the day of *Judgment*, and seems plainly to allude to that *Accession of Happiness*, which they might then expect, as *Primate Usher*

Cl. Win-
det. de Vit.
funct. stat.
c. 7.

has observed from several Passages of the *Scripture*, as well as of *Ecclesiastical Offices* relating to it. Yet he was not aware of that easie account of it, by their Translation from this *Subcælestial Region* into *Heaven*, properly so called. The *Rabbins* also seem agreed in the same Notion, when they made the *Residence* of happy Souls under the *Throne of Glory*. Nor do I know any more likely *Original* of this Opinion among them, than this place of *S. John*. That *Situation* under the *Altar*, which is before the *Throne*, will very naturally make it under the *Throne*. And I know no Footsteps of this form of speaking in *Philo*, or *Josephus*, or any other Author of their Nation of unquestionable Antiquity, and near the *Apostle's Age*. Yet *Philo* owns the *Golden Altar* of *Incense* the more holy of the two, as I have shewn in my Discourse against *Occasional Communion*. And the *Archetypes* of that, as well as of all other *Utensils* of the *Temple*, he places in *Heaven* as *S. Paul* does, and as the *Platonists* did all sorts of their *Ideæ*, which *Word* he also uses in speaking of these Matters. The place therefore of the most happy Souls, till the Day of *Judgment*, must be the middle place now mentioned from the pretended *Didymus*. So the lowermost of those three Partitions will remain for the less perfectly good Souls, that may need any expiatory Pains for fitting

ting them for the *superiour Regions*. And the *Inflitters* of those *Pains* upon them, may be either those *Devils* who are allowed a *Power* in these *Regions* with less *Restraint*, than in the *higher* now mentioned, the *ἀνδρες δαίμονες* mentioned by *Plato*, the *evil Angels* in the *Psalmist*, as *Instruments of Punishment*; or, perhaps the *Angel of Repentance* mentioned in *Hermas*, as a good *Angel*, and as designing all his *Chastisements* for the *Good* of those who are committed to his *Care*; but rather the *Devils* who were the *Executioners* of *Ecclesiastical Censures*, on those who deserved them, even in *this Life*: Yet under the *Restraint* of such good *Beings* as the *Angels of Repentance*, when those *Chastisements* were inflicted on those who retained *amendable Habits of Vices* contracted in *this Life*. These things may, at least, give a probable *Account* of the *Sense* of the *Antients* in this *Matter*. But for the *middle Region*, of which I was speaking, we see the *Scholias*t now mentioned, calls it *Æther*, in *Contradistinction* to *Air*, which is enough to qualifie it for the *Residence* of *Spirits*, and the fairest *Candidates* for *Immortality*. For this is the *Philosophical Term* for that *quinta essentia* (as the *Peripateticks* call'd it) that constituted *Cælestial Bodies*. This will proportionably entitle this upper *sublunary Region* of *Air* as *Æther* to the Name of *Heaven*,

ven, and the *Inhabitants* of it to *Immortality*, as entitles them to the *true Heaven*, as already *Spiritual*, and already partaking of this *Æther*. So the *Pythagoreans*.

Ἦν δ' ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς αἰθέρ' ἐλεύθερον
ἔλθης.

Ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατος. θεὸς ἄμβροτος, ὕψι
δυνήσῃς.

The *Æther* is said to be ἐλεύθερος as free from the *Slavery* of the *Dæmon* ὕλης, whom the *Scripture* calls the *Devil*. And the Ἀθάνατοι θεοί, in those *Golden Verses*, are the *Inhabitants* of the *Æther*, as the Ἡρώες are the *Inhabitants* of the *Air* properly so called, as bounded by the *Earth* below; and the κατὰ χθόνας δαίμονες are the *Manes* from the *surface* of the *Earth* downwards. This is the καθαρόν φῶς desired by *Ignatius* in the *Epistle* to the *Romans*, as a place proper for *Martyrs*, as being above those *Clouds* which intercept the *Sun's Light*, and darken the *World*, and are *Symbols* of the like *Mystical Darkness* to the *Inhabitants* of it. Therefore the Author of *Philopatris*, calls the *Christians* ἀθερίαι and αἰθεροβατῆντας and αἰεροβατῆντας. The last is the word used by *Aristophanes* in his *Νεφέλαι*, where he ridicules *Socrates*. From whence that Author takes the *Fancy* of the *measure* of the *leap* of a *Flea*, which *Aristophanes* makes calcu-

calculated by *Socrates* also. This Author takes occasion thence to expose the *Christians* hopes of *Immortal Happiness* on account of their pretences to this *Ætherial Region*, on pretence of their having the *Spirit*, by turning the Scoff of *Aristophanes* upon them. But he adds the mention of of their *ἀσθενησάν*, in order to the making them more ridiculous than *Socrates*, who contented himself with the *Air*, a Region below the *Christians*. Whilst therefore these *Holy Souls* are in this *Æther*, they are said to be with the Lord, not only as they are one Body and one Spirit with him. For so they are in this World also, and are reckon'd as in him also, as well as he and the Father are said to be in them. The *Λόγος* is by the *Platonists*, as well as the *Christians*, made the Governour of this World. And, as such, his proper Residence should be in this World. And no where more particularly than in that most excellent supreme Region of it. Withal, it is the Privilege of the *Peculium* to be immediately under the Government of the *Λόγος*, and to be so far exempt from those subordinate Governours, (to whom that same supreme Governour has permitted other Societies) as they have qualified themselves, for receiving the Benefits of this Government, by their Purity in *Flesh* and *Spirit*. And, whatever was the Case of *Samuel* and the old *Patriarchs*,
as

as to the particular of the Devil's power over them in the state of Separation; yet there is reason to believe that *their Case is better under the Gospel*. The *Platonists* themselves believe that, in the *Iron Age*, towards the end of the *Annus Magnus*, after the desertion of the Gods, of whom the last was *Astræa*, the Government of the World was impair'd, and permitted to *Τλῆ* and *Ανάγνῆ*, and therefore more liable to the interposition of *Evil Spirits*. But, withal they held that, upon the beginning of a new Revolution, on the return of *Astræa* and the other Gods, and the *nova progenies de celo*, the new Creature; the *Λόγος* undertook the *Helm*, the *πρῶτον*, as *Plato* calls it, and that then the *Golden Age* of *Saturn* was to return, which was to put an end to the mischiefs of the former Misgovernment. So *Hesiod*, and *Virgil* in his famous *Eclogue*. He there makes the *Boy*, upon whose Birth the *Golden Age* was to commence (which *Constantine the Great* interprets Mystically of our Saviour) to put an end to all the mischiefs then prevailing.

Orat. ad
Sanct. cet.
ap. Euseb.
t. 19.

*Te duce, siqua manent sceleris vestigia nostri.
Irrita perpetuâ solvent formidine terras.*

Particularly he has these words: *Occidet & Serpens*. Which the same great *Emperour* interprets of the Devil, so well known by the name of the *Serpent*, who seduced our first Parents in the *Scripture*. And very pro-

probably the Poet might design a *Mystical* meaning by it, when he reckons it among the Privileges of the *Golden Age*. Though his most obvious *literal* Sense may relate to *Pytho* killed by *Apollo*, whom he afterwards mentions as *King* in the time he speaks of: *Tunc jam regnat Apollo*. But the *New Testament* also is very particular in signifying a *diminution* of the *Devil's Power* upon the appearance of our Saviour. Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the Prince of this world be cast out, S. *Joh. xii. 31.* The Prince of this world is judged, *xvi. 11.* Elsewhere the place also is mentioned from whence he is to be cast: I beheld Satan as lightning fall from Heaven, S. *Luke x. 18.* which is yet more plainly described in the *Revelations*, in the visionary Dramatical stile of Prophecie. There a War is represented between *Michael* and his *Angels*, and the *Dragon* and his *Angels*. The event of which was that *Expulsion* of the *Devil* out of *Heaven* now mentioned. So it follows: Neither was their place found any more in Heaven. And the great Dragon was cast out, that old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the Earth, and his Angels were cast out with him, *Rev. xii. 8, 9.* After this follows the *Epinicion* upon this *Victory*, which concludes thus: Therefore rejoyce, ye Heavens, and ye that dwell

in

in them. *Wo to the Inhabitants of the Earth, and of the Sea: for the Devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time, v. 12.* Hence it appears plainly that this *Expulsion* cannot be meant of the *Extinction* of the *Devil's* Power at the day of *Judgment*, because then there will be no *Inhabitants* of the *Earth* that can suffer by him. And the *Congratulations* made to the *Heavens* upon this *Victory*, and to their *Inhabitants*, prove that those *Inhabitants* were they who were principally concerned in the *Fruits* of this *Victory*. Which could not be, unless they had been *Sufferers* by him whilst he was *conversant* among them. And an instance is given wherein they were *Sufferers* by his neighbourhood, that he was continually provoking *God* against them by his *Accusations*. The *Accuser* of our *Brethren* is cast down, which accused them before *God*, day and night, v. 10. This advantage he had by his residence there, that he appeared in the *Assemblies* of the good *Angels*, as appears in the *Book of Job*, and the *History* of the seduction of *Ahab's Prophets* by the *lying Spirit*. These opportunities he must lose of doing mischief, when he was no longer allowed liberty of appearing among them. And so the *Reason* of those *Prayers* for the *Dead*, to preserve them in the state of *Separation*, from those insults of *ill Spirits*, must

must also *cease* when the *Devils* were now no longer allowed access to them. I know not whether S. *Justin* do not intimate it when he makes the *Prayers* for them in his *time*, to be *ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ*, as if, after their *decease*, when they were lodged in their *Ætherial Stations*, they did not then so much need the *Prayers* which were made in their *behalf*; but only while the contest was, whether of the *two* sorts of *Spirits* were to be their *Conductors*. But their *Translation* from this *lower* to the *superiour Heaven*, seems to be reserved for the day of *Judgment*. Then *Death* is to be *swallowed up in Victory*, and to be *cast into the bottomless pit*, and *Adms* too. That I take to be, that when the *separate State* should end (as it must do when the *Soul* and *Body* shall be *joyned* together again, and that *eternally*) then the places of *separate Bodies* and *separate Souls* should likewise have an end also. But this *Victory over Death*, being the *last*, and therefore immediately preceding the *Triumph* of our *Saviour*, must therefore be at the *συντέλεια*, the *Consummation* of all our *Saviour's Mediatorial Office*, as well as of the *World*. Perhaps our *Saviour* intimated this in his saying, *it is finished*, immediately before his own *Death*, because his *own Death* was to be a *means* for *evacuating ours*. Then it is to be *cast into the Abyss*, the *Tzalmuth*, the *shadow of Death*,

Death ; as Death made the departed Souls umbras or Shades, and into the Land of Forgetfulness, as if it had never been. Thus our Lord fulfilled that Propheſie of his own: O Death, I will be thy Death: O Grave, I will be thy Destruction, by taking away the places of ſeparate Souls and Bodies, when the State of Separation itſelf ſhould be at an end. That is, by translating them from the diſtriſt of the βασιλεία θανάτου and φθορᾶς into the true Heaven, the proper Region of Immortality. Then he is to ſurrender his Government to the Father, and to be himſelf ſubject to the Father, when he has brought all the Souls which he has purchaſed, and ſurrendred them to his Father. For he owns the original Property of them to be in his Father: Thine they were, and thou gavest me them, S. John xvii. 9. His Office therefore is the προαγωγή, the bringing them to the Father, anſwerable to the προήλυσις on our parts, our coming to the Father, to bring many Sons unto Salvation; that is, the Salvation ἐξ ὕλης, out of this preſent World, in the Language of the Scripture: that is, out of this ſublunary World (the Government of which had been committed to him by his Father) by translating us into Heaven, properly ſo called, which is the peculiar Reſidence of the Father, for when all things were ſubjected to him, it is manifeſt that he muſt be excepted, who had
sub.

subjected them, as the *Apostle* reasons. That is, that the *Father* himself cannot be included in the account of the things subjected to the *Son*: The *Father* still retains that original superiority that is implied in the Name of *Father*, as being the original *Head* of all this mystical Union. He is the same way the *Head* of *Christ Mystical*, that is, of all *Christ's Mystical Body*, and of himself, as deriving the Name of *Son* from that *Spiritual Seed*, which had by himself been received from the *Father*, and which had by him been communicated to all his *Mystical Body*, making them thereby his *Brethren*, and his *Sons*; as *Christ* himself is the *Head* of the *Man*, and the *Man* also is the *Head* of the *Woman*, from whence the *Woman's Duty* of *Subjection* is likewise inferred. So this *Subjection* principally relates to this *Filiation* of the *Son*, as he has the fulness of the *Spirit*, not as he is the *Λόγος*; which will perfectly overthrow all the *Reasonings* of the *Arians*, as well as of our modern *Soci-nians*. By the *Roman Laws*, a *Son* an *Heir* in *Univocal Generation* (and therefore equal with the *Father* in their common *Nature*) yet compared with the *Father*, differed very little from a *Servant*, as the *Apostle* reasons, either in *Subjection* or *Property*, whilst the *Father* *lives*; which must hold eternally, where the *Generation* is *Eternal*, and the *Father* is supposed to *live* for ever.

And

And even the *Catholick Fathers* own a *Subordination* of the *Son* to the *Father*, as not derogatory to their *Consubstantiality*, and take it to be the Sense of his own Words: *My Father is greater than I*: and this in regard of the *Λόγος* itself. Thus therefore the *Son*, when he has *finished* all the *Concerns* of the *Province* committed to him by his *Father*, and *translated* all his *Subjects* into *Heaven*, the *District* of his *Father*, must then be *subject* to him, as (a *Prince*, returned from his *Province*, is, when he returns from it into the *peculiar Jurisdiction* of his *Father*. And to shew that the Case is indeed so, it is very observable, that, when the *Scripture* describes our Blessed Lord's coming to *Judgment*, it mentions no other *Attendants* but his *Holy Angels*; no *Patriarchs*, no *Prophets*, no *Apostles*, no, nor any *Martyrs*, nor any other *Order* whatsoever of *created Souls*. We are, on the contrary, said to *meet him in the Air*. Not only as our then raised *Bodies* are to be lifted from their *Graves* in *Earth*, but as they are in the *Air*, the *Advs* of *Souls*, to *meet* those *Souls* which are to be *united* to them. Then our *Bodies* also will by him be made *Pneumatical*, when they are *fashioned like his glorious Body*, and fitted for the *Wings* of the *Spirit*, which will then *translate* them to the *highest Heavens*, the *Regions* of *Immortal Happiness* by the *Reasonings*

ings of the *Apostle*, in the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*.

This is the *Divine Spirit*, by which all the *Mystical Union* and *Communion* is maintained. They who partake of it are said to have the *κοινωνία πνεύματος*, and to be *one Spirit* with each other. Yet so as to oblige them to *Unite* in the *Principle* from whence they receive it, as in a common *Head*, as *Brethren* in the *Patriarchal Bodies* were obliged to depend on their *eldest Brother* as the *Successor* of their common *Father*, as to all those *Rights* which the interests of *Societies* made *Indivisible*. Thus God created man in his own likeness, male and female created he them, and called their name *Adam*, *Gen. v. 1, 2*. Here the *Spirit* seems to be meant by the *likeness* of *God*, which elsewhere is ascribed to *Adam* alone, but here to his *Wife* as well as him, as being given *Her* by *Consequence*, as being *One* with *Him*, and with this very *Design* of making her *One* with him. So *Malachy* urges it as an *Argument* for the *Unanimity* of *Conjugal* *Consorts*: *The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously. Yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy Covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the Spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly Seed, Malach. ii. 14.* Here the *Matrimonial Unity*

56.
This Spirit
is the Prin-
ciple of
Mystical
Unity, as
obliging
all that re-
ceive it,
to depend
on him
from whom
they all
originally
received
it. What
is meant by
ἑνός,
or having
Life in
himself.

is attributed to the *Spirit* given to both *Consorts*, to *sanctifie* them in order to the producing a *holy Seed*, and to the making them *One*. Alluding plainly to that *likeness* to *God*, which is in *Genesis* ascribed to that *Adam*, who is there said to have been *Female* as well as *Male*; not to *Eve* at all, though to her also as *one* with him, and indeed in order to the making her *one Spirit* with him, as the *Matrimonial Contract* had made them *one Body*. Yet so, the *Spirit* being given *immediately* to *Adam*, and to *Eve* no otherwise than as *one* with him; this made *Adam* the *Head* of this *Union*, and obliged the *Woman* to a *Dependence* on the *Man* for this *participation* of the *Spirit* derived from him, in order to the *Procreation* of a *holy Seed*. When therefore the *unbelieving Husband* was sanctified by the *believing Wife*; it seems principally intended for a *Convert Wife*, who had been married when *both* were *Infidels*. But, if, after a *Divorce*, or a *Decease* of a *Husband* of the *Peculium*, her *Children* by an *Infidel* were counted of the *holy Seed*; this must have been rather on account of *Favour* to the *Children* than any *Reason* or *Merit* derivable from such a *Parent*. And so it self, an account of the *Holiness* received formerly. Thus the *Man* is called the *Head* of the *Woman*, 1 Cor. xi. 3. Eph. v. 23. Not on a *Civil* account only, but a *Religious* and

and *Mystical* one. I mean, in *Marriages* contracted in the *Peculium*. Thence the concern of *Christian Ministers* in *Christian Marriages*, even from the time of the *Apostles* themselves, as appears from *Ignatius*. The *Man* is said to be the *Head* of the *Woman*, as *Christ* is the *Head* of the *Man*, and as *God* is of *Christ*, 1 Cor. xi. 3. And as *Christ* is called the *Head* of his *Church* as her *Mystical Bridegroom*; and as he is the *Head* of all *Principality and Power*, Col. ii. 10. *Angels and Authorities and Powers* being made subject unto him, 1 S. Pet. iii. 22. And all on the same account of this *Divine Spirit*, and the *Original* from whence it is derived. The *Man* is the *Head* of the *Matrimonial Union*, because the *Woman* receives the *Residue* of that *Spirit* which is given to the *Man*. So is *Christ* the *Head* of *Man*, because even he can pretend no otherwise to this same *Spirit*, than as he is *Baptized* into that *Body*, with which *Christ* also is pleased to contract a *Mystical Marriage*; and thereby to communicate, out of his own *Fulness* of the *Spirit*, those particular *Gifts* and *Graces* of that same *Spirit*, as the *Nuptial Arrha*, and *Douum antenuptiale*, of this most *Sacred Conjugal Bond*, which are requisite both for the *Safety* of their *Souls*, and for discharging their *Duties* in their respective stations in the *Body Politick* of the *Church*. So also he is the *Head*

of the *Celestial* Orders of *Angels*, because they must receive those *Spirits*, which make them πνεύματα λειτουργικά, from the same *Fulness* of the *Spirit* which dwells in him. In this regard the *Heavenly* State to which our *Lord* has exalted us, by giving us this *Spirit*, is an ἰσαγγελία. They are called *Sons of God* in the Book of *Job* and elsewhere. Which makes us their *Brethren*, as partaking of the same *immortal* Seed of the *Spirit* of the *Father*. And our *Lord* is justly called the πρωτότοκος & πάσης κτίσεως as the *Original* and *Head* of all the καινὴ κτίσις, the new Colonies of *Spirits*, without being any κτίσις himself, but as possessing the *Fulness* of that Seed of the *Father*, which gives *Creatures* the honour of a *Celestial* and *Divine* Extraction, by being joyned with them, not by being it self created, but by being sent to inhabit them as κτίται or *Coloni* were in a new founded City, who did not begin their *Being* when they began their *Habitation*. This Notion of κτίσις neither the *Arians* of old, nor our modern *Socinians* were aware of, that I know of. The first *Habitation* therefore of this *Spirit* was in the *Human* Nature of *Christ*, which yet was it self *Eternal*, as his own Λόγος by which the *World* it self was created. Thus also *God* the *Father* was the *Head* of *Christ*, as being the first *Original* of the same *Spirit*, and from whom

whom *Christ* himself received it. But in another way from that by which the *Angels* and we receive it from *Christ*. It proceeds from the *Father* as the *Seed* of the *Father*, and under that Notion is derived to the *Man Christ*, so as to make him also the *Son* of the *Father*. Yet so as to reserve to him all the *Rights* of an *Eldest Son*, because it is not derived to any others but by him. Not even to the *Angels* but by him as *Λόγος*, not unto *Man* but by him as the *Original* by which it is derived to other *Men*, which seems to be the Reason, why even the *Post-diluvian Patriarchs* at least, could not receive it till his *Glorification*. Because till then the *Spirit* could no be expected, as the *Apostle* himself expressly testifies, *S. John* vii. 39. Then we have the first Experiment of it in the *Bodies* of the *Saints*, which then rose out of their *Monuments*, and appeared to many in the *Holy City*, *S. Matth.* xxvii. 52, 53. Nor was it fit that it should have been sooner, because the *Man Christ*, to whom this *Fulness* of the *Spirit* was given, from which all his *Members* were to receive their *shares* respectively. That seems to be his plain meaning in those words: *As the Father hath Life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself: and hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man*, *S. John* v. 26, 27. The derivative

πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν entitles him only to the quickening from whom it is derived, and therefore does not put it in the Power of them who receive it to quicken themselves. That is only in the Power of them who possess it Originally. In them it is the αὐτοζωή, as the Scripture supposes it to be in the Father in regard of the Son, and in the Son in relation to us. This is the meaning of the Platonick term αὐτοζωή, and therefore imports that it is in the Son's Power to raise his own Body, to lay down his Life, and to take it up again, which is here ascribed to the Man Christ, if the latter part of this Sentence have any connexion with the former. Thus, therefore the Resurrection of our Lord's Body is sometimes ascribed to his Father, sometimes to himself very consequently, because the Spirit by which the Son is said to have Life in himself, in relation to the raising his own Body, is notwithstanding it self the Gift of the Father.

57.
Thus therefore all Members of Churches were obliged to depend on their respective Gover-
nours, in order to the receiving of the Spirit.

Thus the Spirit is represented as a Bond of Unity, even in the Originals of the most Sacred Mystical Unity. The Son himself, as Man, can lay no claim to the Spirit, but in Conjunction with the Father, from whom he is immediately to receive it, as from the first Principle of the Spirit. Nor can the Soul of Man receive it, but

by

by its *Conjunction* with the *Son*, from whom all, who will entitle themselves to it by the *Rules* of the new *Peculium*, must immediately receive it. Thus all *κοινωνία* with the *Father* depends on the *Son*. The *Father* himself dwells in the *Light* inaccessible, 1 *Tim.* vi. 16. 1 *S. Job.* iv. 12. Therefore no man hath seen him at any time: The only begotten *Son*, which is in the bosom of the *Father*, he hath declared him, *S. Job.* i. 18. Therefore God shines in our hearts in the face of *Jesus Christ*, 2 *Cor.* iv. 6. As being the *Image* of the invisible God, *Col.* i. 15. *Ἐκὼν* is the word. As we content ourselves to see the *Image* of the *Sun* reflected in the *Water*, when we are not able to behold him with our naked *Eye*. By him therefore it is, as I have said, that we have *μεσσηνισμὸν*, as that answers the *Profelytism* of the new *Peculium*, without which we cannot be made *Citizens* of the *Mystical Cælestial Jerusalem*. So clear it is, that, by this *Headship* of the *Father* to *Christ* it is implied, that none can partake of the *Mystical κοινωνία* with the *Father* but by the *Son*, any more than any distant *Members* can partake of the influences of the *Head*, which do not receive them by *Communication* with those intermediate *Members* through which they are to be derived. The same also is the Case of *Christ* himself as the *Head*, in relation to

the Spirit; whoever has not the Spirit of Christ is none of his, Rom. viii. 9. As not holding the head, from which all the Body, by joynts and bands, having nourishment, ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God, Col. ii. 19. Where we see this same Reasoning allowed in the Mystical Body, which none can doubt of in the natural Organical Body. No doubt, to let us understand that God intends to deal with us accordingly. And so indeed God has contrived the matter, even among Men, that, though all derive the Spirit from the Son, yet all should not have it from him immediately; but that all should receive it from some one Principal Person who was designed by God as the Principle of their Unity, upon whom he intended they should depend if they would entitle themselves to the same Spirit. So the Spirit of Moses was to be derived to the LXX Elders, Numb. xi. 17, 25. So Elisha inherited a double portion of the Spirit of Elijah. According to the right of an Elder Brother, by the Law, who was to have twice as much as any of his Brethren of their common Inheritance. So S. John urges his own Communion as the means by which all were to expect Communion with the Father and the Son, 1 S. John i. 3. Implying, on the contrary, that they who did not so entitle themselves could lay no claim to the Mystical Communion with the Father and

and the Son. And that is indeed supposed in all the *Reasoning* of his *first Epistle*, which plainly supposes all, who were out of that *Communion*, to be in *darkness, death and error*, the *contraries* to the *benefits* of the *true Communion*, of *Light and Life and Truth*. He speaks there not only in the name of the *Apostolical College* then joyned to him in *Ephesus*, as when he speaks in the *plural number*; but also in his *own* as the *Visible Head* of that *Mystical Union and Communion*, as the *rightful Head* even of those *Apostles*. The same was afterwards the *Case* of all *Bishops* who succeeded the *Apostles*, or rather the *Head Apostle*, in this very *Prerogative* of being *Heads* of *Catholick Unity*, of being the only *Authorized Representatives* of the *Original Mystical Heads* of it, the *Father* and the *Son*, both as to the *Admission* to this *Union* of the *Spirit*, and *Exclusion* from it, with a *Right* to *oblige* the *Father* and the *Son* to *ratifie* their *Acts* in *Heaven*, as I have shewn in my *Parænesis*. Then every *Church* succeeded the *Church* of *Jerusalem* in that *supreme unappealable Power* of *obliging God and Christ* immediately to *receive* those to the *Heavenly Communion* who were *received* by them, and to *exclude* those from *Heaven* whom they should judge worthy to be so *excluded*, by the *Doctrine* of the *Catholick Church* in the *first and purest Ages* of *Ignatius* and *S. Cyprian*. Then
every

every *Bishop* had the same Power of acting either way in the affairs of his own *Church*, as the *Head Apostle* had, not only for the district of *Jerusalem*, but also for the whole *Church diffusive*, as being then *subject* to the district of *Jerusalem*, as I have endeavoured to prove in my Discourse concerning *One Priesthood* and *One Altar*. The whole *Reasoning* of the *Scriptures* supposes the same *Dependence* in the Society of the *Church* in relation to the *Spirit*, as there is between the Members of the *Organical Body*, in order to the *Communication* of *Vital* or *Animal Influences*.

58. The *Apostle* supposes the like Variety of *Offices* in the *Polity* of the *Church*, as there is in the *Members* of the *Human Body*. He supposes the same Variety of *Gifts* and *Graces* of the *Spirit*, requisite for the *discharging* of these *Offices* in the *Church*, as of *natural Powers* and *Influences* for performing the *Functions* of the several *Members* of the *Animal Body*. He makes the same mutual needs of each others assistance between the *Political* as between the *Animal Members*. So that even the noblest *Members* of the *Spiritual Society* need the *Gifts* of the inferior *Members*, as well as the *Inferiours* need the more *honourable Talents* of their *Spiritual Superiours*. Among these *Members* of the *Visible Body* he owns a *Spiritual Head*, as well as *Feet*, or *Hands*, or *Eyes*,
on

The Spirit was not, in the earliest Ages, thought derivable to any Members of the Churches, but from the Heads of those Churches.

on which the rest of the Members of the Political Spiritual Society must (by the tenor of this Reasoning) depend as much for deriving Spiritual Influences as the Animal Members depend on the Head for their Vital Influences. This being supposed, it will be as impossible for any Member of the Spiritual Body to have the Spirit, when separated from the Head, as it is for any Animal Member to retain any remainder of Animal Life, when separated from the Animal Head. So it must be if this Unity of the Spirit be purposely designed by God for confederating a Political Body under a Monarchical Head. They must necessarily lose the Spirit, who divide themselves from the Head of the Body from which alone it can be expected. And God has contrived the Fact so, that it can be expected from none besides. God alone conveyed the Spirit to the Son. The Son alone gave it to the Apostles, first preparatively, by breathing; then by giving the Gifts themselves, with the Evidences and Proofs that they were really given, to the satisfaction of those who saw them in the day of Pentecost. And the Apostolical degree is reckon'd as the first of all these Extraordinary Offices: first, Apostles, secondly, Prophets, &c. As the Standard, of all other, even Extraordinary, Officers, who were not otherwise to be believed to have this Divine Spirit,

rit, if they pretended to any *Revelations* different from those of the *Apostles*; or to receive it by any *Ministry* besides. The *Spirit* was given to *Cornelius* at the preaching of *S. Peter*, though without the *Imposition* of his *Hands*, in that singular *Extraordinary* instance, by which the *Apostle* himself was to be convinced that *God* did not look on *Cornelius* as *unclean*, because he was not *circumcised*. Thenceforward the *Ordinary* way of receiving the *Spirit* was only from the *Apostles*, and not otherwise to be received from them than by *Imposition* of their *Hands*. Then whosoever had not so received the *Spirit* could not be presumed to have it at all. Thus the *Unity* of the *Spirit* united all that pretended to it to the *College* of the *Apostles* in general, and in them to *Christ* their *Head*, as being themselves the *Twelve Foundations* on *Christ* himself, as the *chief corner stone*. For this

Parznesf.

Ep. ad Fab. *Cornelius* argues, that being *Baptized* a
 Ant. ap. *Clinick*, and wanting the *σφραγίς* of the
 Euf. H. E. *Bishop*, he could not have the *Spirit*: Τὸ
 vi. 43.

μὴ τυχεῖν, πῶς ἂν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοῦ τυχεῖ;

The Spirit is that by which we are sealed after we believed, Eph. i. 13. That is, on the Profession of our Faith required in Baptism. And sealed to the day of Redemption, Eph. iv. 30. The Seal is that by which the ἐκὼν is impressed, that is, of the Second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, the Spirit, in the Reasoning of S. Paul, which is given in our Saviour's Baptism. And the notion of Sealing alludes to the Distinction God is pleased to make between his own Favourites and others, in times of Publick Epidemical Calamities. It is called Sealing, them in their Foreheads, in Ezekiel and the Revelations. By which Sealing, as by a Mark, God is said to know those who are his, as by a Seal, 2 Tim. ii. 19. So the Spirit is the Mark by which we have a Title to have our Bodies Immortaliz'd at the Resurrection, which is the Redemption, Rom. viii. 23. S. Luke xxi. 28. This therefore was then given by the Bishops only, as the Successors of the Apostles, as the Spirit was given by none but the Apostles, whilst they lived. So the Bishop of Asia gave the σφραγίς to the young Man recommended to his Care by S. John, in the Story mention'd by Clemens Alexandrinus: And that in his φώτισμός. Which plainly shews that the σφραγίς τὸ πνεῦμα here spoken of, is the same with the Baptismal Spirit, that true φῶς from whence

Τίς ὁ μὲν
σφ. ὁ
Eul. H. E.
iii. 23.

our

our Saviour's Baptism came be entitled to the name of *ῥαντισμός*. *Valesius* there shews that the name of *σφραγίς* is used for the *Baptismal Spirit* in the eldest Monuments of the Church, as I have also shewed it so used in the *Scriptures* themselves. This that Bishop took for the *τέλειον φυλακίσθαι*, which made him remit of his Care afterwards, when he thought him sufficiently fortified against the attempts of the *Evil Spirit*, by his reception of the *Good Spirit*. Which plainly shews that the *supreme Baptism* was here intended, the *Peculiar benefit* of which was, to give the *Good Spirit* to those who were rightly disposed for it by the previous *Discipline* they were to undergo while they were *Catechumens*, and by the *Baptism of Water* also. Among the *Principles* of the *Doctrine of Christ*, the *Apostle* reckons *Baptisms*, *Ebr. vi. 1, 2.* in the plural Number: meaning the *Baptism of Water*, as *Distinct* from that of the *Spirit*. And they were indeed more distinct in the *Practice* of that Age, than we now are commonly aware of. The *Baptism of Water* was *Purgative* or *Cathartick*, to use the proper term of that Age for expressing their *Initiatory Mysteries*, for purifying from the pollution of former Sins, and of the *unclean Spirits*, which were then supposed to possess the *purest Moralists* before their reception into the *Christian Society*. This Bap-

Baptism was usually administered by lower Ministers, even where the principal Person was present, by whose Authority the Ceremony was performed. Our Saviour himself is said to have Baptized more Disciples than S. John the Baptist. Yet not in his own Person, but only by his Disciples, S. Joh. iv. 1, 2. But he did not give the Spirit by them, but at a considerable distance afterwards. Indeed not till after the Resurrection at Pentecost. Then it was that he baptized, even the Apostles themselves with the Holy Ghost and with Fire, that is, with the Shechinah of the fiery cloven Tongues. So in the Case of Cornelius, S. Peter commanded him to be baptized with Water, after God had immediately baptized him and his with the Holy Ghost, Act. x. 48. It seems the Baptism of Water, was below the dignity of an Apostle to perform in his Person. So S. Philip the Deacon baptized the believing Samaritans, Act. viii. 12, 13. But the Spirit was not given them till two Apostles, S. Peter and S. John, laid their hands upon them, v. 15, 16, 17. So among the many Corinthians who pretended to be of Paul, the Apostle himself assures us, that very few had really been baptized by him, though the main occasion of those Divisions seems to have been, that each of them seems to have denominated himself from the Preacher, from whom he had received his Baptism. I know

know no Expedient so likely for *reconciling* these so seemingly different appearances, as if we should say, that greater numbers were *baptized* by his *Authority* in that same Church of *Corinth*, than could pretend the honour to have received their *Water Baptism* from his *Person*, that being a Favour reserved for some few of more *eminent* Station, which the Instances now mentioned shew to have been probable, considering the *Sentiments* of that *Age*. Yet it will turn to the same account, if we allow the greater number of those *Corinthians*, who gloried in his *Name*, to have received the *higher Baptism* of the *Spirit* by the *Imposition* of his *Hands*, though they had received their *Water Baptism* from some other Preacher. This was indeed the *Baptism* that gave *Profelytes* the fairest pretences for *Glorying*. And the *Ministers* of this more *Honourable Baptism* were *themselves* more *honourable*, and therefore more likely to give occasion to *Ostentatious Dividers* to distinguish *Parties* by their *Names*. If this were so, *Apollos* also, the *Head* of those who called themselves from him, might have given the *Spirit* also. And it is not improbable but that *second College* of the *Jerusalem Profelytes*, who had *Catholick Jurisdiction*, might have that *Power* so necessary for the first *Foundation* of Churches.

But

But whether they had so then, or not, there appears no likelihood that the last Apostles, or Jerusalem Proselytes, left any but Bishops in possession of that Right of conferring the Baptismal Spirit. That higher Baptism had, in the first Monuments of the Church, another Symbol, by which the Spirit was signified and conferred, distinct from the Symbol of Water, that of Oil. And in this regard, it is reckoned as a distinct Sacrament from the Water Baptism by S. Cyprian, when he would have Proselyted Hereticks and Schismatics, received *utroque Sacramento*. Meaning that way of conveying the Spirit by Imposition of Hands, as well as the Baptism of Water. Yet both of them may be contained under the one common name of Baptism, as it was the Right of our Saviour's Baptism, exceeding all other Baptisms then known of, to convey the Spirit; and as our new Sacramental Regeneration under the Gospel is not only of Water but of the Spirit; yet we do not find any beginning of this Symbol of Unction in the very early Ecclesiastical Monuments, which mention it. Nor could there have been so great a Consent of the Primitive Churches in using it, if it had descended from any other Original but that of Tradition derived from the Apostles, by the Reasonings of Tertullian, and S. Augustine,

59.

None but Bishops were left by the Apostolical Age in possession of this Power of giving the Spirit. And they gave it by Unction which none could consecrate besides themselves;

gustine, and *Vincentius Lerinensis*. The Spirit it self is called *Unction* by *S. John*, which implies it to have been given by that same *Symbol of Unction*, in that very time when *S. John* wrote that *Catholick Epistle*. For he seems to Reason here from the *Symbol* by which the Spirit was given, as *S. Paul* does from the descent into the *Water*, and ascending out of it, to the duties of dying and ascending with *Christ* in *Baptism*. And why should our Lord's having the *Fulness* of the Spirit be expressed by his being anointed with the Oyl of Gladness above his *Fellows*; but because it was the known way of giving the Spirit received among the *Jews* to their *Kings*, *Priests* and *Prophets*, to convey it by the *Symbol of Oyl*? So it was in the Case of his *Fellows*, as appears by the eldest *Monuments* next those of the *New Testament*. And it being the same Case before under the *Old Testament*; it is hard to doubt but it must have been so in the middle space in Cases not *Extraordinary*, which were intended as *Precedents* for all future Ages. Our *Saviour's* instance was indeed *Extraordinary*, who could not receive the Spirit in the *Fulness* of it by any *Humane Ministry*, nor therefore by any *Visible Symbol*, being Himself the *Original* from whom all others, not *Men* only, but *Angels* also, were to receive

receive it. So also was the Case of *Cornelius*, when the Apostles *themselves*, who were the *Ordinary Ministers* for giving the *Spirit*, were to be *instructed* that God did not look on his *Uncircumcision* as any *obstacle* against his *receiving* it, which they had not *known*, but by that *Extraordinary* way of God's giving the *Spirit* to *Cornelius* immediately *without* their *Ministry*. Withal, we have expresse Testimonies in the *New Testament* it self for giving the *Grace* of *Healing* by this very *Symbol* of *Oyl*, in the *Gospel* of *S. Mark*, and the *Epistle* of *S. James*. Why should one *single* Benefit of the *Spirit* be conveyed by the *Symbol* of *Oyl*, and not rather the *Spirit* it self, when it self is called an *Unction*, and the *giving* it to our Blessed Lord *himself* is called an *anointing* him? How can we better judg of the *Practice* of the *Apostles* Age, when the *Scripture History* is silent on both sides, than by so plain Testimonies both *before* and *after* it? In truth, it had been morally impossible for the *Governours* afterwards to have *confined* the *Conveyance* of the *Spirit* to certain *Symbols*, if they had not received them as so *confined* by *Divine Revelations* to the *Apostles*. They could not have *obliged* God and *Christ* to ratifie in *Heaven* what they performed on *Earth*, if they had not had God and *Christ's* *Authority*

thority for connoting the *Spirit* with the *Symbol* of *Oil*. They could not *then* have *imposed* their own *Sentiments* on *others*, who would have thought their own *Rights* invaded by this *Confinement*, if they had *introduced* the *Confinement* without an *Authority* sufficient to justify it. The *Fact*, whether the *Apostles* had *Authorized* it, required no depth nor sagacity of *Reasoning* then to *discover* it, but was as manifest to the *meanest* as the *ablest* *Understanding*. And the *nature* of it, being such as that *all* were concerned in it, made it so *notorious* as that it required no admission to *Secrets* to know whether it were so. Every individual *Member* was obliged to entitle himself to the *Spirit*; which yet he could not attain without the *Unction*, after the *Governours* (who were alone believed to have the *Power* of conveying the *Spirit*) had *confined* their *Conveyance* of it to this *Eternal Symbol*. Indeed this way of conveying the *Spirit* by *consecrated Oil*, excluded all *others* from any *Right* of conveying the *Spirit* who had not the *Power* of *Consecrating* the *Oil*, by which it was to be *conveyed*. What *Mutinies* then, what *Animosities*, what *Oppositions* within, what *Scandals* without, must have followed, if any had been *excluded* from *Rights* possessed *before*? And how could they have

have prevailed that had encroached, when they had no Power to force their Subjects, but the Conviction of their Subjects Consciences, concerning their own Right; and wherewith all the Right it self, wherever it was, must have been so notorious? How could all the different Independent Churches have been so unanimous in owning this Claim, if it had indeed been an Encroachment? It is not probable that all would have yielded their Rights willingly. Much less is it probable, that they could have been forced by the Practices of single Persons to part with them unwillingly, when there was no other force that could be offered to them, but pure Considerations of Conscience, granted on the merit of the Cause it self. This Force could not take place but where the Righteousness of the Cause was very manifest. However, when this Practice of conveying the Spirit by Uction prevailed: none could pretend to the Divine Spirit who had not thus received it. The Bishops alone were owned to have the Power of Consecrating the Oil by which it was to be administered. Thus the Uction of the Spirit could not be given without the Bishop's consent. Whenever the Presbyters gave it, they could not do it without the Oil consecrated by the Bishop. And even so they did it

with a *difference* that plainly owned their dependence on the *Bishop* in doing it, besides their use of his *consecrated Oil*. The *Anointing* on the *Forehead* was reserved to the *Bishop*, as a *Prerogative* of his place. This obliged the Persons so *anointed* to attend the *Bishop* himself afterwards, that he might *ratifie* in his own *Person* what had been before performed by his Power only *delegated* to the *Presbyters*. And very fitly at that time when the *Baptized Person* also *ratified* in his own *Person* that same *Covenant*, which had before been transacted in his Name by their *Stipulators*. This kept the *whole Church* (the *Presbyters* themselves not excepted) in a perpetual dependence on the *Bishops* in order to their partaking of the *Union* of the *Spirit*. And that even in regard of the *highest* and *noblest Baptism*, that of the *Spirit*, without which none can make out his *Title* to any *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son* perfectly ; as the *Reasonings* of S. *Ignatius* and *Tertullian*, suppose in this very Case of *Baptism*. Nor can I find that even this *delegated* Power of *conferring* the *Spirit* by *Oil* consecrated, not by themselves, but the *Bishops*, was ordinarily communicated to *Presbyters*, before the *Fourth Century*. Then first we find it observed, and observed as a singularity by *Hilarius Surdus* commonly
 mista-

mistaken for S. Ambrose, and the Author of the *Questions* in the *Old* and *New Testament*, under the name of S. Augustine; that in *Alexandria* and *Ægypt*, *Presbyters* did use it when there was no *Bishop* present. Consecrate is the word used by the one, as consignare is by the other. Consignare in all likelihood alludes to the *σφραγίς*, the name of the *Baptismal Spirit*, as I have already shewed in the earliest *Monuments*. For this, *Tertullian* uses the word *signare*. So: *Caro ugitur ut anima consecratur, caro signatur ut anima muniatur, manus impositione adumbratur, ut anima spiritu illuminetur, de Res. carn. c. 8.* So the *Signati* in *frontibus* in the *Rites of Mithra* are by him compared with the like Practice in our *Christian Baptism*, *de Præscr. c. 40.* And in S. *Cyprian*: *Muniatur frons ut signum Dei incolume seruetur, Ep. 58. Pleb. Theb.* And the word *consignare* is thus applyed by him, *Et si frons signatus est* [He speaks of the Church] *neq; bibere inde, neq; consignari potest, cui foris posito accessus ad fontem non est, Ep. 69. Ed. Oxon.* His *signum* also is in *fronte*, as before. And again, *Frons cum signo Dei, Diaboli coronam ferre non potuit, coronæ se Domini reservavit, de Laps. & de Unit. Eccl. & ad Demetrium. Testimon. adv. Jud. c. 8.* And this is in truth the most proper Consecration of our Persons when the Holy Ghost

is conferred upon us, which is indeed, the *Principle* of all *Personal Holiness*. This therefore being then observed as a *singularity* in the Church of *Alexandria*, seems plainly to imply, that the generality of the other *Catholick Bishops* had not then so far delegated their Power, as to enable *Presbyters* ordinarily to confer the *Spirit* as their *Proxies*. It was not so in the *West*, when *S. Hierome* wrote against the *Luciferians*, as appears by his Reasonings, what *inconveniences* would follow if they had not received it from the *Bishops*. He need not to have been put to that *shift* if he could have pleaded any general *Ordinary* delegating from the *Bishops* for that purpose, which might have enabled them to do it, though exceeding the *Power* of their own *Order*; much less, if he could have proved their own *Order* sufficient for that purpose, without any such delegation. Least of all, if he could truly have pretended that this was the *received* Opinion of that *Age*. *Inconveniences alone* that must necessarily befall them who want the means appointed by *Christ* for attaining the *Spirit*, cannot discharge any from their *Obligation* to use such means if they will pretend to any *Right* to the end for which they were appointed by him. I know none in the *West* that allowed this delegated *Unction* by *Priests* with

with Oil consecrated by Bishops. So clear it is, that the *Right* of conferring the Spirit was Originally in Bishops, and none but Bishops; and that the *Right* of Presbyters to do it was later, and no more than what they could derive from the Conversion of Bishops in whom it was Originally. This obliges all, who will pretend to the Spirit, to a strict dependence on them, and is alone sufficient, by the Reasonings, even of those best and purest Ages, to oblige all to depend on the Bishops, who desire a solid Title to the Good and Divine Spirit. And it will, on the contrary, be just Presumption against the pretensions to the true Spirit, if they violate the Unity of the Spirit, who pretend to have the Spirit. That cannot be a Good Spirit which is derived from any but the Bishops, to whose disposal God has, by these Reasonings, confined the Spirit. That cannot be a good Spirit, which encourages Divisions, or which weakens the obligation to Unity thus settled by God: which makes the Graces of the Sacraments easily and frequently attainable without the the Sacraments: which makes them attainable in different and contradictory Communions: which makes them attainable at Altars separate, not only from the true Bishop, but from Episcopacy it self: which allows such Perfection in this Life, as perfectly to super-

supersede the use of *Sacraments*, to entitle to the *Heavenly Communion* immediately, without any *external Communion* on *Earth*. Such *Spirits* as these cannot possibly be that *same Spirit* which unites all that partake of it in one *Communion*, under one *Bishop* by the firmest *Ties* of *Spiritual Interest*. They must therefore be *wicked Spirits*, and *Spirits* of *Error*, if it be a *good Spirit* that is derived by the *Ordinances* of *Christianity*. This is very applicable to the Case of our *Episcopal Brethren* in *Scotland*, whom you mention as favourable to *Mrs. Bourignon*. Yet the account given by her Admirers of her *Girls* instructed by her, that they proved *Witches*, is a particular ground of just suspicion that it could be no *good Spirit* which she pretended to. Yet her fancy was so possessed with this *Event*, that she pretends it as a *Revelation* from *Christ* himself, that the greatest number of those who profess his Name are in *express Covenants* with the *Devil*. As extravagant was her designed journey to *Jerusalem* in *Man's* *Gloaths*, when she knew not on what *Point* of the *Compass* *Jerusalem* lay. It had no *Event* worthy a *Divine Inspiration*. But it might have had a very *ill one* if the *Providence* of the *Good Spirit* had not timely interposed for preventing the ill *Consequences* of that *illusion* of the *Evil one*. How
her

her Executor Monsieur Peiret can account for these things I know not; no more than I can guess, where he has concerned me in his *Disputes* concerning her.

Thus, I hope, I have shewn that this Doctrine of the *Distinction* of the *Soul* and *Spirit* (how little soever observed in our modern *Systems*) is neither *Unscriptural* nor *Uncatholick*, but indeed more agreeable to *Scripture* and *Tradition* too, than what is advanced as *inconsistent* with it. I may now add further its greater *use* for solving the greatest *difficulties* in *Religion* now disputed, which yet were no disputes in the *Primitive Church* before the *modern Hypothesis* was thought of. It is most certain that our *Bodies* were at first created *Mortal*. There had otherwise been no more need nor *use* of the difference of *Sex* then, than there will be at the *Resurrection*, when *Individuals* will be *immortalized*. The *use* of them is only to preserve the *Species* when the *Individuals* cannot be preserved. Nor had there otherwise been any *use* of the *Tree of Life*, to make them *Immortal*, if even their *Bodies* had been *immortal Naturally*. But a *naturally mortal Soul* is more suitable to a *naturally mortal Body*, than a *Soul* that is *naturally Immortal*. Why then should the *Body* have been made *mortal*, even then, if the *Soul* had been *Immortal*? This would have

60.

A naturally mortal Soul is more agreeable to be joyned with a naturally mortal Body, as a constituent of Human Nature, than a Soul naturally immortal.

have been more easily accounted for, if the *Body* had been no part of our *Human Nature*, but perfectly *preternatural* to the *Soul*, which was the *Opinion* of the most celebrated *Philosophers* and *Hereticks* also. But this was fundamentally *destructive* of the *Opinion* of the *Catholic Church* concerning the *Resurrection*, which proceeds on the Supposal of the *Body's* being a part of the *Man*, and therefore concerned in *sharing* in the *Reward*. This being so, the *Man* is destroyed upon the *Dissolution* of the *Union* between the *Soul* and the *Body*, and is no more concerned in the State of his *separate* Parts, than his own *Body* is in the *separate Elements*, into which it is dissolved in the *Grave*. But on the *Principles* now mentioned, all things are clear. The *Mortal Body* had a *Mortal Soul* join'd to it, which, together with it, made up the *Chorical Man*. The $\pi\nu\omicron\eta$ or *Flatus* was *preternatural* to him, as designed to fit him for a *supernatural* State of *Happiness*. This was to cause the $\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, the *Conversion* of the *Soul* to that *supernatural Principle* of the *Divine Spirit*, by *Union* with which he was to hope for *Immortality*. It was also to enable him for the $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$, by which the *Union* was to be begun, as being it self $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ to the *Spirit*, with which the *Union* was designed. And in the mean time,
being

being it self also of a *Nature Divine* in an *inferiour* Sense, it self was *Immortal* also, and communicated a *derivative Immortality* to the *lower Soul*, so long as the *Union* with the *Soul* was continued; but left it *capable* of the *actual Mortality*, which was *natural* to it, whensoever it should leave it. This might be the *Case* at the *Day of Judgment*, that the *Soul* being *deserted* by the *lower Spirit*, might relapse to the *Mortality* that was *natural* to it, when it had now no *Body* to support it. This is a *clear Account* how this *wron* as distinct from the *wreōua*, might put *Mankind* in that *middle State* between *Mortality* and *Immortality* which the *Fathers* suppose, to be *determined* to either, by the *Event* of his own *Free-will*.

Withal, this *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of the *Human Soul*, clears the *Catholick Doctrine* of *Original Sin* from exposing all *Mankind* to *Eternal Torments*, even *Infants*, for the *single* and *personal Act* of *Adam*. It was, in truth, that *new Doctrine* of the *natural Immortality*, then newly espoused, when the *Pelagian Disputes* began, that forced them upon that *Consequence*. That *Doctrine* obliged them to believe all *Human Souls* concerned in the *general Judgment*, as well those that never did, nor could, hear of the *Gospel*, as those who did.

And

61.

By this Distinction on the best and clearest Account may be given of the truly Catholick Doctrine of Original Sin.

And because they only knew of *two* Sentences then; the one to *Eternal Rewards*, and the other to *Eternal Punishments*; and they knew such as *never* heard of the Gospel, could not pretend to the *Rewards* of the Gospel; they thought the Consequence inevitable, that they must consequently be allotted to its *Eternal Punishments*. S. *Augustin* did not here consider, what himself so frequently grants on other Occasions, that the *contrary* Doctrine of the *Souls natural Mortality*, had then gained so great and numerous Suffrages, that even himself durst not condemn it; nor was he aware of those great and early and *Apostolical Authorities*, that allowed of *Preaching* and *Believing*, and being *Baptized* in the *separate* State, to leave them *inexcusable* who should fall short of the *Salvation* intended for them, much more those who should incur the *Punishments* which were not intended for them, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. He did not consider how careful *God* is, where *Punishments* are concerned, especially such *irreparable* ones as admit of no prospect of a good *End*; to purge himself from all Suspensions of *absolute Power* and dealing *arbitrarily*, which yet is the *Subterfuge* he found himself reduced to, that he might defend these Imputations so *dishonourable* to *Infinite Goodness*: How
 God

God appeals herein to Rules of *Human Equity*, even to the *Judgment* of the concerned Persons themselves, as far as their *Concernment* might be consistent with their *Equity*, to let them see that *themselves* alone were to *blame* for whatever they should suffer by the *Divine Sentence*, and to leave them *inexcusable*. But he did not so concern himself to enquire into *Original Tradition*, as had been requisite in a Case of that Importance, but contented himself with *present Authorities* and *received Opinions*. Nor does he seem very conversant in *Christian Authors*, even when his Concern against his *Adversaries* obliged him to it. But the *Principles* now explained, give an easie account of the *Catholick Doctrine*. All that *Adam's Posterity* necessarily lost by *Adam's Sin*, was only *preternatural Favour*, and the *Consequences* of it. Their being deprived thereby of the *immortalizing Principle*, left them only in that State of *actual Mortality*, which was *natural* to them, and which must necessarily have been their Lot, if God had not designed them for *Favours* and *Fruitings* beyond their *Nature*, to which the *infinite Goodness*, that is essential to his *Nature*, does not oblige him. Their not being raised above this *World* to a *Celestial State*, as it exposes them to the *Calamities* of this *World*, and to the *Power* of

of the *Prince of this World*, so far as God is pleased to permit him to exercise his Power in it, so it leaves them capable of all the *Happiness in this World*, to which their prudent Management may entitle them, by the Rules of his general Providence. And their wanting the *supernatural Principle* for subduing their Passions, may expose them to the *Sufferings in this World*, which are the natural Consequences of unsubdued Passions. And, even in the *other World*, the habitual Inclinations contracted by an undisciplin'd Management in this Life, may expose the Souls, who have them, to many Penal Consequences: to the Frustrations of the Appetites, and Aversations themselves, when they shall be fixed and inflexible, and yet no possibility of satisfying them; to the Indispositions for Heaven and Heavenly Pleasures, and Conversation with good Spirits, and to Dispositions to unreasonable and impossible Designs, and to a Congruity of Inclination with the cursed Spirits, which must accordingly give them a more absolute Power over such Souls, during the time of their Existence, though that should not prove Eternal, though it should not depress them to the outer Darkness, the blackness of Darkness reserved for the Day of the general Judgment. Withal, the Loss of the Divine Image, first occasioned by Adam's Fall,

Fall, will expose all *Human Souls*, who bear his *Image* of the *Soul* only, without the *Spirit*, to most of the *Consequences*, commonly believed according to the received *Doctrine* of *Original Sin*, excepting that of *Eternal Punishment*, which cannot be proved by any good *Authorities* before *S. Augustin*; no, not even by those which *S. Augustin* has produced for that Purpose. On the contrary, *S. Chrysostom*, as great a Name in the *Greek Church*, as *S. Augustin*'s was in the *Latin Church*, is full against it; besides the elder Testimonies of *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Tertullian*. Here is the *Darkness* of the *Understanding*, commonly observed in the *Modern Systems*, when the *Divine Spirit* is lost, which is called *Light*, from the *Restitution* of which *Spirit* our *Christian Baptism* has the Name of *Illumination*. Thence follows the *Power* of the *Devil* over such *Souls* when they are thus reduced within his *Jurisdiction*, being themselves *Darkness*, and within the *Darkness* of this *World*, of which the *Scripture* stiles him the *Prince*. Thence follows their *Slavery* to *fleshly Lusts*, and the *Body* of *Sin* and *Death*, when they have lost that *supernatural Power* which could alone have enabled them to *subdue* them. Nor can any more, than these things, be proved by any clear Testimonies of the truly *Catholick Primitive Church*.

X

Church. Whatever is more, is only to be ascribed to the conjectural Conferences of S. *Augustin*, for which the truly *Catholic Church* ought not by any means to be responsible.

62.

The same Distinction gives an easy account of the Doctrine of Reprobation, so far as that Doctrine is Scriptural.

So also the Doctrine of Reprobation is easily accounted for by these same Principles. Reprobation in *massâ purâ*, has no Countenance in Scriptures: no, nor in Reasoning, but by that absolute Arbitrary Power, which is every where renounced by God in his Expostulations, concerning the Equity of his Proceedings with Mankind. And the Foundation of Reprobation to Eternal Torments, even in *massâ corruptâ*, is overthrown by what I have now said, to shew, that even *Adam's Sin* makes no Man, as he descends from him, liable to Eternal Punishment: because the *injury* derived from him, is, by the *Apostle* himself, supposed Mortal; and therefore cannot qualify the Person, so descending from him, to subsist under a Punishment that would otherwise, in regard of the Efficient, by which it had been inflicted, have been Eternal. The most tolerable Account of this melancholy Doctrine, is that which makes Reprobation not a positive Decree for damning the greatest part of Mankind eternally; but rather a Negative, a Preterition, a Non election, or not taking in-

to

to the number of *God's Favourites* and *chosen People*. This is indeed intelligible, and reconcilable with the essential *Goodness* of *God*, if even this *Preterition* have no worse *Consequence* than the *Deprivation* of *Persons*, so passed by, of such *Advantages* only, as are the *Privileges* of *Favourites*. But the *Doctrine* of the *natural Immortality* of the *Soul*, makes *Eternal Misery* a *Consequence* of that *Preterition*, as inevitable to the *Persons* concerned in it, as if they had been *predestinated* to it by a *Positive Decree*. For it makes them necessarily concerned in one of the *Eternal Father*, to which *Men* are to be sentenced at the *final Judgment*. And this for *Conditions* which *God* was never pleased to put in their *Power*, though withal he, at the same time, knew that they were not in their *Power naturally*. In this Case, to pass them by, was necessarily to conclude them under the contrary Sentence of *Eternal Condemnation*. But this is easily avoided, supposing the *Nature* of the *Soul Mortal*. *God* may certainly chuse what *Nations* or *Persons* he pleases, for his *preternatural Favours*, without derogating from his *Attribute* of *Goodness*. And he may as freely pass others by, and not admit them. And all the *Consequence* of such a *Pretermision*, in reference to *Supernatural Favours*, would be to leave them

intirely to their own *Nature*, which, as it would admit of no *Immortal Enjoyments*, so neither of *Immortal Calamities*. Here is nothing *harsh*, or *difficult*, or *irreconcilable* with God's *other Attributes*.

63.
It gives
withal, the
easiest ac-
count of
the Justice
of Eter-
nal Tor-
ments.

It is also another of the *greatest Difficulties* in our *Modern Theology*, to give a Reason why the *Sins of finite Creatures* should be punished with *endless Torments*. I know the *Schools* have invented several; but such as were as well *unknown* to the *Antients*, as they are in themselves *unsatisfactory*. I cannot now allow my self *Respite* to descend to *Particulars*. The most plausible I take to be, that which is given by *Dr. Hammond*, that of *Option*. Nor can I see any thing *harsh*, if God be pleased to *oblige* us to accept of *Eternal Pleasures* under *Pain*, if we do *not*, of incurring *Eternal Punishments*. It is rather *agreeable* to his *Goodness* to *oblige* us to be *happy*, by such means as he knows most *efficacious* with our *reasonable Natures*. And *Punishments* are indeed *so*, and are accordingly *threaten'd* by all prudent *Legislators*, as the *greatest Severities* for having those *Laws* punctually observed, which are of the *greatest Moment* for the *Publick*. Such is the *Disingenuity* of our *lapsed Human Nature*. But then that *Reasoning* of the excellent *Dr.* can only take place in such Cases

as are really capable of Option. Which cannot be pretended in *Infants dying Unbaptized*; nor in *Heathens*, who never heard of the Gospel. These could not make a Choice of either, who neither knew that it was in their Power to be eternally Happy, nor that God had obliged them to make a Choice. Much less, that he had done so on so severe Terms, as to make their Neglect of it Penal eternally. That Hypothesis therefore can give no reason why either of these should be liable to such a Punishment. Nor indeed, can any better Reason be given, why they should be so punished. Nor is the Scripture clear in either Instance, that it shall be their Case. Still it is the received Opinion concerning the Soul's natural Immortality that has perplexed our Modern Divines on these Subjects. But, if God be pleased to leave both of them to that Mortality, there is nothing harsh, in either Case, that can justly be complained of. Yet *Infants* may have the Benefit of their Innocence (Reward they cannot pretend to) even in their separate State. They may thereby be qualified for Conversion with good Spirits, and indisposed for receiving the Harm of the ill Offices of those that are malignant. And those good Angels, whom the Antients believed to be intrusted with the Patronage of Children at their Nativity, and which

The Distinction between

our Saviour himself alludes to and owns as well as they, may as well protect them in their *separate State*, as they do in their *Bodies*, and secure them from being *miserable* in *either State*, though their Condition be not so *happy* as it *might* have been, if they had been *baptized*. The *Air* between *Earth* and *Heaven* (which was the *Abode* of the *Antients*) was taken to be the *common Receptacle* of *Souls*, both *good* and *bad*, till the *Resurrection*; and of *good Spirits*, as well as *bad*, as God was pleased to *permit* the one to *order* the other. However, the *Devil* is the *Prince* only of the *Darkness* of the *Air*, and the *Souls* that are there, are no otherwise *subject* to him, than as they also are *Darkness*, as indeed the *Scripture* supposes them to be, before they are *illuminated* by the *Baptismal Spirit*. Yet that does not hinder, but that they may receive *Irradiations* and *Assistances*, and many other *good Offices*, from the *good Spirits* which are supposed ordinarily to converse *there*, as well as the *Devils*; exactly on the same account as they did whilst they were here on *Earth*, which being *lower*, should therefore be more obnoxious to the *Power* of the *Devil*, as he is the *God of this World*. And by the same *Reasoning*, the *Air* may have more of the *Conversation* of *good Spirits*, as being near-

er

in Heaven, the place of their *constant* Residence. This may make their *separate* Condition, for the time of their Duration, more *happy* than it was in *this* World, notwithstanding the Power the Devil is supposed to have over them whilst they are within his Jurisdiction; because his Power so limited in this World, is so limited by the Laws of Providence, and the Interposition of good Spirits. And indeed so happy, as abundantly to make amends for the Infelicities such good Heathens may have suffered in *this* Life, though they should not be immortalized, nor have any share in those Eternal Rewards which are to follow after the Day of Judgment, as the Prerogative of the new *Paculum*. The Happiness of the intermediate Space between their Death and the Judgment, may sufficiently reward the Sufferings of so short a Life as ours is, and give them just Occasion to glorify the Bounty of their Creator to them, though he has not been pleased to advance them to the highest Rank of Favourites: Yet, though even *this* had been necessarily, which no Attribute can prove so: I have also shewn how God may, by means unknown to us, put it in their Power to attain this greater Honour, by allowing them the Benefit of a Baptism

The Distinction between

in their *separate State*, with the *Means* necessary to qualifie them for it, of *Preaching* and *Faith*. And for the *Fact*, that he has done so, I have produced great *Authorities* in the *freshest Memory* of *Apostolical Tradition*. And I have endeavoured to prove all so, as to give no *Advantage* to any who might reckon on the like *Favour now*, to the *Prejudice* of *Ordinary Discipline*, since that *Discipline* has been *established*. That *Extreme* ought certainly to be provided against by such as would reason solidly and prudently, as well as the other of *Uncharitableness*. It can no more be true *Charity* that is inconsistent with *God's positive Institutions*, and the *Discipline* settled by them, and that allows Men to hope for the same *Favours* in the *Neglect*, or even *Contempt*, of that *Discipline*, than it can be *Discipline* that interferes with the *Offices* of true *Charity*.

64.
The Con-
clusion.

Thus I have given you, worthy Sir, my *Reasons* why this *Distinction* of *Soul* and *Spirit* seems to me neither *Unscriptural* nor *Uncatholick*: but on the contrary, more agreeable both to *Scripture*, and the *Fountains* of *Apostolical Tradition*, than those *contrary Opinions* or *Explications* which are advanced in *Opposition* to it in our *Modern Systems*. You will thereby find that most of your *Objections* proceed on a *Mis-
take*

Stake of the Catholick Doctrine and my Meaning in this Matter. I think I have cleared it from those ill Consequences and Scandals wherewith you thought it chargeable. I have also shewn, what you seem to grant, the great Usefulness of it for solving several of the most difficult Questions in our late Divinity; which might alone suffice to recommend it to the Favour of all Well-wishers to our common Religion, though it had no other Evidence of its being true. Yet I am willing to hear what you or any other Friend can say to convince me, if I should prove mistaken. I am (though unknown)

Yours affectionately,

Henry Dodwell.

212

253 1798 Jan 14 2

MYSEVM
BRITAN
CATALOGUE
OF
BOOKS

Printed for Richard Smith at the Angel and
Bible without Temple-Bar; Where Gen-
tlemen may be furnished with all sorts
of New BOOKS that come out, and
have ready Money for any Library, of
what Language soever.

BOOKS in Folio.

G Georgii Bulli, S. Theologicæ Professoris
& Presbyteri Anglicani (nunc Episcopi
Minev.) Opera omnia; quibus duo præcipui Ca-
tholicæ fidei Articuli de S. Trinitate & Justi-
ficatione, Orthodoxè, perspicuè ac solide expla-
nantur, illustrantur, confirmantur; nunc demum
in unum Volumen collecta, & multo correctius
quam ante; una cum generalibus Indicibus edita.
Quibus jam accessit ejusdem Tractatus hætenus
ineditus de Primitiva & Apostolica Tradi-
tione dogmatis de Jesu Christi Divinitate, con-
tra

35
tra *Danielem Zuickerum ejusq; nuperos in Anglia Sectatores; subnexa insuper pluribus singulorum librorum capitibus prolixa quandoq; Annata Joannis Ernesti Grabe, cujus etiam Præfatio huic Volumini est Præmissa, Lond. 1703. Price Bound 1 l. 10 s.*

The Arguments and Reports of *S. Henry Pollexfen* Kt. late Lord Chief Justice of the *Common Pleas*, in some special Cases by him argued during the time of his Practice at the Bar, together with divers Decrees in the High Court of *Chancery* upon Limitations of Trusts of Terms for Years; The whole Printed from the Author's Original Manuscript. Revised and Corrected with his own hand, and Published with the allowance and approbation of the Lord Keeper, and all the Judges, Price 1 l.

3. *S. Orl. Bridgmans* Conveyances, being select Precedents of Deeds, and Instruments concerning the most considerable Estates in *England*, drawn and approv'd by that Honourable Person in the time of his Practice. The second Volume carefully corrected, to which is added a Table, and every particular Covenant noted in the Margin, to which it refers, Price 9 s.

4. *Chirurgia Curiosa*, or, the newest and most Curious Observations and Operations in the whole Art of Chirurgery, written originally in *Higb Dutch*, by *Matthæus Gothfre-*

thofredus Purmannus, chief Chirurgion of the City of *Breslaw* in Germany, and of the Hospitals of *S. Job*, and *All Saints*. Illustrated with large Chirurgical Figures, of Patients as well as Instruments invented by Dr. *Solingen*, curiously Engraven on Copper Plates. To which is added, *Natura morborum medicatrix*, or, Nature Cures Diseases; wherein the Energy of Nature is demonstrated, her Operations explained, and her various steps rendred intelligible. By *Conrade Joachim Sprengel*, M. Physio-didactus. Price 12 s.

BOOKS in Quarto.

1. The New Art of Spelling design'd chiefly for Persons of Maturity, teaching them how to Spell and Write Words by the sound thereof, and to sound and read Words by the sight thereof, Rightly, Neatly and Fashionably, By *J. Jones*, M.D. Price 2 s. 6 d.

2. *Solon*, or, Philosophy no defence against Love, a Tragi-Comedy, with the Masque of *Orpheus* and *Eurydice*, written by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 1 s. 6 d.

3. The History of the Campaign in Germany, for the Year 1704. under the Command of his Grace the Duke of *Marlborough* Captain General of Her Majesties Forces, with an impartial Account of the

two

317
two famous Battels of *Schellenburg* and *Blenheim*, and the Lists of the Killed and Wounded and taken Prisoners, from the time of his Grace's setting out to his Return to *White-Hall*, the second Edit. Price 1 s.

4. Good Advice to the Ladies, shewing, that as the World goes, and is like to go, the best way for them is to keep unmarried; a Satyr, with the Character of a *Beau*, written by *Dan. de Foe*, 2d. Edit. 1706. Pr. 6 d.

5. The King of *Prussia's* Right to the Principality of *Orange*, stated; Published by the Order of the Baron *Spanheim* 1703.
Price 1 s.

English BOOKS, Octavo.

1. The Mysteries of *Opium* revealed, by *Dr. Jones*, Chancellor of *Landaff*, and Member of the College of Physicians, and formerly Fellow of *Christs College* in *Oxford*, Price 5 s.

2. Paraphrase and Annotations on all *S. Paul's* Epistles, done by several Eminent Men at *Oxford*, Corrected and Improved by the late Reverend and Learned *Bp. Fell.* Pr. 6 s.

3. *C. Julius Cæsar's* Commentaries, of his War in *Gaul* and Civil War with *Pompey*, to which is added *Aulus Hirtius Opus's*, Supplement of the *Alexandrian*, *African* and *Spanish* War, with the Author's Life, adorned

ed with Sculptures, from the designs of the famous *Palladio*, made *English* by Captain *Bladen*, Price 8 s.

4. *Beaumont's* Historical, Phisiological and Theological Treatise of Spirits, Apparitions, Witches, and other Magical Practices; containing an account of the *Genii*, or, Familiar Spirits both Good and Bad, that are said to attend Men in this Life, Price 5 s.

5. The Antient Religion of the *Gentiles* and Causes of their Errors considered, the Mistakes and Failures of the Heathen Priests, and Wise Men in their Notions of the Deity, and Matters of Divine Worship, are examin'd, with regard to their being altogether destitute of Divine Revelation; with a compleat Index. By the Learned and Judicious *Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, &c. Price 5 s.

6. *Boccaline's* Works compleat in 5. Vol. Englished by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 1 l. 1 s. 6d.

7. History of *Charles the Vth.* Emperour and King of *Spain*, the great Heroe of the House of *Austria*, containing the most remarkable Occurrences that happened in the World for the space of 56. years, all Nations being in greater or less measure engaged in the Contests and Confusions of those times; Translated from the *Spanish*, Price 6 s.

8. Bp.

319
8. Bp. of Cambridge's Characters and Criticisms on the Ancient and Modern Orators, Poets, Painters, Musicians, Statuaries, and other Arts and Sciences; to which is added a Poem, in Blank Verse, Entitled, the Age of Lewis the Great, Price 3 s. 6 d.

9. Theory of Sciences illustrated, or the Grounds and Principles of the seven Liberal Arts, by Hen. Curson, Gent. Price 5 s.

10. Several Discourses Preached on particular occasions before the State, in the Cathedral Church of S. Patrick and Christ-Church, Dublin; by Will. Sheridan, Ld. Bp. of Kilmore and Ardagh, and Episcop. Price 5 s.

11. Christian Perfection, consisting in the Love of God explained, in several Letters to a Lady, Price 5 s.

12. The Vanity of Conquests and Universal Monarchy, being a succinct account of all the great Heroes both of Ancient and Modern Ages, deduced from Nimrod to Lewis the XIVth. of France, by Geo. Smith, Esq; Price 5 s.

13. Dodwell's Occasional Communion, fundamentally destructive of the Discipline of the Primitive Catholic Church, and contrary to the Doctrine of the latest Scriptures, concerning Church-Communion, Price. 2 s. 6 d.

14. —De Schismate Anglicano Parænesis ad Exteros tam Reformatos, quam etiam Pontifi-

*tificios qua Jura Episcoporum vetera eorum-
demque à Magistratu seculari Independentia
omnibus asserenda commendantur, Price 4 s.*

15. — *Exercitationes duæ de Ætate Phala-
ridis & Pythagoræ, Price 4 s.*

16. — *Conference between Soul and
Body, Price 2 s.*

17. *Tale of a Tub reversed, for the uni-
versal Improvement of Mankind, Pr. 1 s. 6 d.*

18. *Reflections of our Common Tack-
ings, Pr. 2 s.*

*Abstract of the most curious Thoughts
of Seignieur Montaigne.*

*As likewise in Folio, Baron Spanheims
Numismata, under this Title, Ezekielis Span-
hemi Dissertationes de Præstantia & Usu Nu-
mismatum Antiquorum in uno Volumine. Fol.*